



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

THE
HUNGARIAN CONTROVERSY:
AN
EXPOSURE
OF THE
FALSIFICATIONS AND PERVERSIONS
OF THE
SLANDERERS OF HUNGARY.

BOSTON :
REDDING & COMPANY, 8 STATE STREET.
1852.

THIS pamphlet is not a history of the Hungarian War, nor even, except incidentally, a defense of the motives and character of the Patriots and Heroes of that war. The great mass of the American people are well satisfied that the contest between Hungary and the House of Hapsburg, was a contest for FREEDOM and DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS, against DESPOTISM, USURPATION and PERFIDY. That there are any among us who entertain different sentiments, is owing altogether to the labors of the North American Review, and the New York Courier and Enquirer, the editors of which, Messrs. Bowen and Webb, from motives that I need not discuss, have seen fit to oppose themselves to the general opinion, not of this country only, but of the civilized world. Their attacks upon the Hungarians have been widely and zealously circulated—Mr. Bowen's articles, I am told, having been distributed as a pamphlet distinct from the Review in which they appeared. The calumnies thus propagated have found their way even into the Senate of the United States, and have there been urged in debate, in opposition to the Resolution of Welcome to Kossuth.

Messrs. Bowen and Webb rely for support of their theories on quotations from a number of books and documents of more or less authority, from which they have culled such passages as would serve their purpose, and have paraded them as conclusive evidence against the Hungarians. The best reply to this line of argument, in my judgment, is a critical examination of these "authorities," and an exposure of the mode in which the quotations from them have been made. This is what I have attempted to do,—with what success the reader can determine for himself.

I have likewise devoted considerable space to the consideration of Mr. Bowen's grossly unfair reply to Mrs. Putnam, who, in the Christian Examiner, had criticised his articles on Hungary with eminent ability, and with a degree of knowledge on the subject to which no other American can pretend. It will be seen that on every point which he has endeavored to make against her, I have shown that she is right and he wrong, by the very testimony to which he himself appeals.

I have endeavored, in conclusion, to give briefly a plain and accurate statement of the case between Austria and Hungary, and of the true causes and objects of the Hungarian Revolution. To those who desire full and reliable information on these subjects, however, I recommend a book recently published at Philadelphia, "*Hungary and Kossuth*," by Rev. Dr. Tefft, of Cincinnati.

A considerable portion of the following essay appeared last winter in the Boston Atlas, but as the controversy to which it relates is now more fully than ever before the public, it is not inopportune to republish what was then written.

Cambridge, Mass., Dec. 24, 1851.

R. C.

THE HUNGARIAN CONTROVERSY.

MR. BOWEN'S FIRST AND SECOND ARTICLES.

THE attack upon the Hungarians was begun in this country by Mr. Francis Bowen, with an article, entitled—"The War of Races,"—in the *North American Review*, for January, 1850, which embraced, he declared in a preliminary letter to the *Boston Daily Advertiser*, the results of a good deal of "labor and research." Prefixed to it, by way of text, was the title of an able and impartial work on Hungary, by a French writer, M. Degerando, who had long resided in that country, and was probably better acquainted with its real condition than any foreigner who had yet written about it. Mr. Bowen stated, in the beginning of his article, that "we depend for information chiefly on M. Degerando's book, and on a series of excellent articles contributed by E. de Langsdorff and H. Desprez to the *Revue des Deux Mondes*." [*War of Races*, p. 79.] These are the only authorities to whom he refers, with the exception of a document published in the *New York Tribune*, an incorrect translation of the Hungarian Declaration of Independence.

Mr. Bowen's use of the best of these authorities, M. Degerando, is fully and correctly stated in the following passage from Mrs. Putnam's First Article in the *Christian Examiner*, Nov., 1850, p. 423 :

"The work of Degerando, which the *North American Reviewer* selects as the theme of his article, was published in 1848, before the commencement of the war, and gives no intelligence from Hungary later than the summer of 1847. It cannot, therefore supply information in regard to the war or its immediate causes. It contains, however, full and accurate accounts of the political institutions of the country, and of the character and condition of the various classes of the population. We regret that the

Reviewer has not availed himself of the information thus afforded. We cannot, indeed, but express our surprise at the treatment which a writer of the high standing of Degerando, has received at the hands of the editor of the *North American Review*. After placing the title of this work at the head of his article, and citing the name of the author among his authorities, he does not again refer to it. There is not a statement of fact or opinion in the article which can be attributed to M. Degerando; and the greater part of it is in direct contradiction to the statements of that author. Yet, though the work of M. Degerando is professedly under review, the writer of 'The War of Races' gives no intimation that any such contrariety of opinion exists between himself and his supposed authority; he passes no judgment upon the work; he cites none of the author's statements, not even to controvert them. The charges against the Hungarians contained in that article, went forth to the world, therefore, with the sanction of the respected name of Degerando. Three months afterwards, in another article, written to support the assertion made in the former one, the Reviewer, for the first time, alludes to his dissent from the opinions of Degerando; the only notice of the work which is supposed to make the subject of 'The War of Races,' is to be found in a *note* to the article on 'The Politics of Europe.'

It appears, then, that Mr. Bowen's "labor and research" were confined to a few articles in a popular French magazine, the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, from which, also, he admits, he derived almost the whole of his "information." The *Revue* has long been notorious for its anti-republican tendencies, and the authors of its articles on Hungary, MM. de Langsdorff and Desprez, are royalists, apologists for Austria, and admirers of Haynau and Metternich. The use which Mr. Bowen has made of their articles, and the extent to which he is indebted to them

for "information," are so extraordinary, and have so decisive a bearing upon his character as a historian and a man of letters, as to render it advisable to enter at some length into an exposition of his obligations to them.

In "The War of Races," [pp. 106, 7, 8,] there is an elaborate account of a distinguished Hungarian Magnate, Count Széchenyi, which in point of style and of information, is perhaps the best and most striking passage of the article. If original with Mr. Bowen, it would have deserved the credit it has received as the result of considerable research. It is in fact, however, entirely translated, without the slightest acknowledgment, from an article by M. de Langsdorff in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for Decem-

ber, 1848. Yet Mr. Bowen prints it as altogether his own production. He does not give the least intimation that he is indebted in its composition to any one, but offers it as the result of his own researches upon Hungarian history. The sketch of Széchenyi in the *Revue* fill a space equal to fifteen or twenty pages of the *North American*. Mr. Bowen's translation, in three pages, is of course abridged in parts, but it is chiefly by omissions which did not suit his purpose, because they were favorable to the Hungarians.

I have made a literal translation of some portions of De Langsdorff's article, that the reader may compare it with the corresponding passages of Mr. Bowen's:

"The Danube had been, as it were, forgotten and neglected by the Hungarians. Repelled by the difficulties which its navigation presented at two or three points, they had confined their use of it to sending down-stream some *bateaux de transport*, and large rafts, which were to be broken up when they arrived at their destination. Széchenyi comprehended, as he says in one of his works, that here was a magnificent gift of Providence, which man had left unused. He built at Pesth a boat of a light and stout form, and descended with some intrepid boatmen, the rapids and shoals hitherto regarded as impracticable. There was universal enthusiasm in Hungary when it was known that these new Argonauts had happily passed the redoubtable Iron Gates, the last cataracts of Orschowa. Patriotic subscriptions were organized everywhere in order to begin the necessary works and to found a navigation company; skilful engineers soon removed the principal obstacles, and within a year after the adventurous expedition of Széchenyi, a line of steamboats was in full activity upon the upper and lower Danube, from Ratisbon to Vienna, and from Vienna to Constantinople. * * * The Austrian Government assisted in this movement, and contributed to the enterprise considerable funds. Prince Metternich figured among the first stockholders, though he jested sometimes upon the pretensions of the Hungarians 'who thought they had invented the Danube.' The name of Széchenyi was already famous; no one knew, however, the extent and variety of his mind. At this period many of his countrymen regarded him only as an engineer, more skilful than those who had preceded him, but his political genius soon showed itself with that superiority which imposes upon the multitude the chiefs whom they think they choose themselves. A series of publications upon all the subjects which then occupied men's minds, established the political reputation of Széchenyi, and decid-

"His first enterprise, commenced twenty years since, was an attempt to improve the navigation of the Danube, a work of immense importance, as we have shown, to the prosperity of the country. The obstructions in the river were so great, that only large rafts and some *bateaux* were sent down-stream, to be broken up when they had once arrived at the Black Sea. Széchenyi built at his own expense a light and stout boat, in which he descended the river himself, and ascertained that the rocks and rapids were not so formidable as had been supposed. He then organized a company for removing the greatest obstacles from the bed of the stream, and placing a line of steamboats upon it. The undertaking had complete success, and within one year the boats were plying regularly from Ratisbon to Vienna, and from Vienna to Constantinople. The enterprise excited great enthusiasm in Hungary; the Austrian government favored it, and contributed largely for its execution. Metternich himself was pleased, and became one of the first stockholders, though he laughed at the boasting of the Magyars respecting it, 'who thought they had invented the Danube.' This work made Széchenyi very popular; but as yet his countrymen regarded him only as an able engineer. He soon showed himself, however, a politician and publicist of the highest rank, by a number of pamphlets published in quick succession, advocating with great eloquence and ability some important changes in the Constitution of the state and the relations between the peasants and the nobility. These pamphlets were the first productions of importance written not in Latin or German, but in the Magyar tongue. * * * The brilliant reputation which Széchenyi acquired was earned as much by his temperance and his regard for justice and the rights of all, as by the boldness of the changes that he proposed. 'I wish,' he remarked, 'to awaken my countrymen so that they may walk, and not that they may throw

ed the rest of his life. These pamphlets were written, not in Latin or German, but in the Magyar tongue. It was the first time that works of such importance had been published in that idiom. * * * Széchenyi's popularity and glory were unequalled; he was in truth the first citizen of his country, as this title he merited as much by his respect for justice and the rights of all, as by the boldness of his plans of reform. He had roused his country without overturning it, and such had always been his ambition. 'I wish to awaken my countrymen,' said he to a foreigner, 'so that they may walk, and not that they may throw themselves out of the window.' His name was in every mouth. The counties vied with each other in sending him patriotic addresses and diplomas of citizenship, which gave him the right of voting in their local assemblies; when he arrived in any village, the peasants with music at their head, went out to meet him, all wishing to see and hear him, and calling him their father and their liberator. The Diet of Transylvania did homage to the eloquent publicist by sending him a gold pen, several feet in length; his name was given to the first steamboat that furrowed the Danube; the national academy, the circle of the nobility, and the institute of the Hungarian language, at the same time elected him their president. In every drawing room at Pesth, strangers might see an engraving representing Széchenyi, in a sort of apotheosis, amidst luminous clouds; beneath, Hungary coming out of chaos, and the Danube, covered by vessels of all nations, rolling majestically its placid waters adown the levelled rapids of Orschowa." — *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Tome 24, pp. 683, 684, 689.

themselves out of the window.' His popularity became immense. His name was in every mouth, and the counties vied with each other in sending him addresses of congratulation and rights of citizenship. When he arrived in any village, the peasants went out to meet him with music, and called him their father and liberator. The Diet of Transylvania sent him an entire gold pen, several feet in length, and the national academy, the circle of the nobility and the institute of the Hungarian language, at the same time elected him their President. His name was given to the first steamboat which glided down the River Danube; and in every drawing room at Pesth, the stranger might see an engraving in which Széchenyi appeared in a sort of apotheosis surrounded by luminous clouds, while beneath, Hungary was represented as coming out of chaos, and the Danube, covered by vessels of all nations, flowed on majestically, not fretted by rocks or rapids, towards the sea." — *North American Review*, January, 1850, pp. 106-7-8.

Compare, also, the following passages, which I have selected on account of their brevity :

"The beau-ideal of this government, was it not the ancient diets, where 80,000 nobles assembled on horseback on the plain of Rakos, to deliberate upon peace or war, uttering altogether the formidable cry, 'To Arms!' after which no scrutiny of the vote was needed?" — *Revue*, Tome 24, p. 675.

"The custom, indeed, has a historical meaning; it throws a broad light on the ancient constitution of the diet, which consisted of 80,000 mounted nobles, assembled on the plain of Rakos to determine on war or peace, and uttering all together the formidable cry, 'To Arms!'—after which no scrutiny of the vote was needed." — *N. A. Review*, p. 105.

"The Hungarian constitution seems to have been made entirely for the profit of this class, or rather this class is the constitution itself. The Hungarian noble is, and calls himself a member of the crown of Hungary; *membrum sacrae coronae*; he is part of the sovereignty. * * * If we wish for a parallel we must recall the government of Ancient Poland, and the definition of J. J. Rousseau: 'There the nobles are everything, the burghers nothing, and the peasants less than nothing.' " — *Revue*, T. 24, p. 676.

1*

"The ancient constitution of Hungary was made, as we have seen, solely for the benefit of this class; in their favor, for the protection of their order, the Golden Bull of Andreas II. had been issued. Hitherto every one of their number had called himself a member of the crown of Hungary; he was a part of the sovereignty. Their idea of the constitution corresponded perfectly to Rousseau's definition of the government of Poland, 'where the nobles are everything, the burghers nothing, and the peasants less than nothing.' " — *N. A. Review*, p. 109.

From the last instance, it will be seen that Mr. Bowen is indebted to De Langsdorff for even his quotation from Rousseau !

I am sorry to say that these are not isolated cases. Mr. Bowen's "War of Races" is nearly sixty pages long. Four or five of these pages consist of acknowledged quotations, but the remainder is put forth as entirely of Mr. Bowen's own composition—as the result of his own "great labor and research." It has been so accepted by the readers of the North American Review, and Mr. Bowen has received considerable credit for it, having, it is said, been appointed to the Professorship of History in Harvard University on account of the historical merit of that article. Nevertheless, I affirm that, of the sixty pages of that article, at least fifty are taken directly from the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, either by literal translation, or by a process of abridgment which any person who understands French, and can write tolerable English, could perform nearly as well as Mr. Bowen has performed it. And no acknowledgment whatever has been made for this, though, indeed, no amount of acknowledgment would be sufficient to justify the passing off such a translation as an original historical essay. Mr. Bowen's admission, that he "depends for information" chiefly on M. Degerando's book, and on the articles of Langsdorff and Desprez, does not meet the case at all. It is not merely "information" that Mr. Bowen has derived from the *Revue*; he has taken from it his narrative, by literal translation, or by an easy abridgment; he has taken from it nine-tenths of his facts; he has taken from it his rhetoric, the very ornaments of his style; in short, all that in any kind of composition ought to be particularly the writer's own. If I may so speak, he has not studied and digested these French essayists, and re-produced their substance in a form of his own growth, but he has torn them limb from limb, and with the mangled fragments has put together a distorted and disjointed figure, which he has arrayed in the garments and jewels of his victims.

I say distorted and disjointed, for Mr. Bowen has not only plundered Messrs. De Langsdorff and Desprez, but he has perverted them in the most outrageous manner. They are royalists and apologists for Austria and for Metternich; but, though ill-informed and prejudiced, they are not destitute of honor and a sense of justice—they did not begin to write with the intention of deliberately slandering a whole nation. They admit a great deal in favor of the Hungarians.

They allow much credit to the nobility for effecting reforms and yielding up their privileges; and though they describe with severity the condition of Hungary in former times, they mention, without reluctance, the immense improvements of the last few years. But Mr. Bowen, in translating from them, systematically omits all that they say in favor of the Hungarians, and converts all their unfavorable conjectures, "perhappes," and "it is possibles," into downright dogmatic certainties. He suppresses all that they say in praise of the Hungarian leaders, and exaggerates all that they say against them. I will give two instances of this perversion, out of dozens which I could cite. In the "War of Races," [p. 110,] Mr. Bowen gives a short and sneering account of Kossuth. The sneers, of course, are Mr. Bowen's own, but the rest is translated from the *Revue*, [Tome 24, p. 266,] from an article of De Langsdorff, who in the very paragraph from which Mr. Bowen translates his "information," says of Kossuth, that he is "a democrat of the new revolutionary school, who will seek to get rid of the nobility when he shall have got rid of Austria," and that he "has not feared to overthrow the whole political and social state of his country, to realize dreams of universal equality, more chimerical in Hungary than any where else." Mr. Bowen quits De Langsdorff when he comes to this passage, skips it, and goes on translating from the rest of the paragraph, leaving the gap to be filled up by the following rare specimen of his own original composition :

"In fact, Kossuth's party, ever since it was organized, has been endeavoring to effect a complete separation of Hungary from Austria, the preservation of feudal privileges, and the dominion of the Magyar race, being more important in their eyes than the promotion of the commercial and other material interests of the country, and the intellectual cultivation of its people !"

Again, ["War of Races," p. 89.] a passage is quoted, in which De Langsdorff says :

"I shall never forget the impression I received when on the bridge which crosses the Danube at Pesth, I saw every peasant, every poor cultivator of the ground, rudely stopped and compelled to pay toll both for himself and for the meagre horses harnessed to his cart. The tolls are heavy, amounting to a considerable sum for these poor people; while the Magyar gentlemen, mounted on fine horses, or seated in elegant carriages, passed and repassed without payment. * * * This exemption, it is true, was but a small affair, and tyranny has other practices that are far more odious : but from that time I was no more astonished by the inequalities and anomalies which I witnessed during the rest of my journey; I had foreseen them all on the bridge at Pesth."

With these last words Mr. Bowen concluded his quotation. And why? Because M. de Langsdorff went on to say:

"The feeling which I experienced, others shared with me. In 1836, the diet decreed that the nobles should be subjected to toll on the suspension bridge which was about to be constructed at Pesth. This was the first breach made in the privileges of the nobility; and it was by the nobility that it was made. There, where I felt only a sterile emotion, generous citizens, sacrificing their interest without hesitation, found the opportunity to repair a long injustice. Since that time the Hungarian nobles have walked resolutely in that path; it is they who for twenty years have been laboring to file the chains of their subjects; it is they who in a solemn day, have willed to break them forever."—*Revue des Deux Mondes*, Aug. 1, 1848.

These perversions will give some idea of the spirit in which Mr. Bowen wrote his article, and of the manner in which he perverted his "authorities" into a seeming support of his charges against the Hungarians. And I must beg the reader not to suppose that these are rare instances, which I have carefully detached from the body of the article. On the contrary, such perversions constitute the very essence of the "War of Races," and pervade it throughout, to an extent that is scarcely to be imagined by one who has not gone into a careful analysis of it, and compared it paragraph by paragraph, and line by line, with the documents on which it professes to be based. In the *Christian Examiner*, Mrs. Putnam has, in her peculiarly guarded and temperate manner, very justly described its character. She says, [p. 428]:

"We are reluctantly compelled to affirm that there is no portion of the article on the 'War of Races,' on which the reader can safely rely. We do not exaggerate, and we believe that all those persons who have an acquaintance with the history of Hungary, and who have read the article in the *North American*, will sustain us when we say, that there is hardly a sentence in this article in which an error is not either expressed or implied; in many portions of it, error is so interwoven with error, that the baffled critic turns from the task of refutation as from the entrance to an inextricable labyrinth. We are disposed to believe that the absence of any formal and labored confutation of the article on the 'War of Races'—to which absence the author appeals as a proof of its invulnerability—may be attributed to the Herculean labor which the task of correcting all the errors contained in this historical essay seemed to involve, and the great length to which such a confutation must be extended, if the task were thoroughly executed. These errors pervade every part of the article, and are almost as numerous in that portion which relates to those periods of Hungarian history which are most familiar to the general reader, as in those whose investigation requires a certain degree of research."

In confirmation of this opinion, I will quote that of another person, very competent to judge of such a question. Count Gurowski, a man of great learning and ability, who has held a high official position in Russia, and who is intimately acquainted with the affairs of Eastern Europe, and who, moreover, is neither a Magyar, nor a partizan of the Magyars, but on the contrary is a Slavonian, and has been a prominent leader of the Pan Slavistic movement, which is most hostile to the Magyars, said, in February, 1850, in a review of the "War of Races":—

"It is a thick and dark forest of errors in historical or rather unhistorical quotations, as well as in reasoning. Almost every line requires rectification. Almost all motives assigned to the actions of individuals, as well as to the mass of the people in Vienna, in Hungary, and in the Slavonian countries, are put in a false light, and denote by the quoted French authorities perfect ignorance or perfect bad faith. As most of the facts are misrepresented or shown in the falsest possible light, so almost all the deductions are at least erroneous; and it cannot be otherwise, as a disfigured fact very naturally produces the most false conclusions; and the number of these is infinite, so as to render their rectification impossible."

This is certainly strong language; but it has peculiar weight from the fact that Count Gurowski used it in the most friendly spirit towards Mr. Bowen, whom, at the time, he regarded as the unconscious victim of the misrepresentations of the writers in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*.

The "War of Races" was followed by a second article on the same subject in the *North American Review* for April, 1850, the tone of which was, if possible, still more unfavorable to the Hungarians, while the mode in which it was put together was not a whit more creditable to the literary honesty of Mr. Bowen. One or two instances of this peculiar mode will be sufficient. In attempting to throw discredit on the government of Kossuth, a work entitled "Louis Kossuth and the Recent History of Hungary," by Arthur Frey, is referred to as an authority which "will not be disputed by the sympathizers with Kossuth and his party." Mr. Bowen admits that he has not seen this book, but says that he borrows some extracts from it, from the *London Athenæum*. The first and most important of these extracts then follows, [N. A. R., April, 1850, p. 499,] introduced by "Mr. Frey says." Now, in reality, Mr. Frey says no such thing. The passage which Mr. Bowen endeavors to palm off as Frey's, is a portion of the editorial in the *Athenæum*, and of no more authority than the statements of any other anonymous English

newspaper writer! See *London Athenæum*, Aug. 29, 1849, p. 855.

Repeatedly, in this second article, Mr. Bowen adduces as a proof that the Hungarian movement was not at all republican, the fact that in the Manifesto which is sometimes called the Declaration of Independence, the word Republic does not occur. The force of this objection will be felt, when it is remembered that in the *American Declaration of Independence* the same omission occurs, the words republic or republican not being mentioned or alluded to. A fact which Mr. Bowen, at that time Professor of *History* in Harvard University, does not seem to have been aware of—or if he were, thought fit to overlook it in his zeal to find fault with the Hungarian Declaration.

MRS. PUTNAM'S REPLY TO MR. BOWEN.

These articles of Mr. Bowen were severely and ably criticised by various Journals of Boston and New York. But the first elaborate reply to them was made in the *Christian Examiner*, for Nov., 1850, [continued March, 1851,] by Mary Lowell Putnam, of Roxbury, Massachusetts. Mrs. Putnam is a daughter of the Rev. Dr. Lowell, and a sister to the poet, James Russell Lowell. Her extraordinary attainments in languages and general literature had long commanded the respect and admiration of a wide circle of friends and acquaintances, though from her modest indifference to notoriety, her reputation had hitherto scarcely reached the public ear.—Of the extent of these attainments some idea may be formed from the fact that Mrs. Putnam has made herself acquainted, and in most cases well acquainted, with Greek, Latin and Hebrew, with French, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, German, Swedish, Danish, Hungarian, Polish and Russian, with Turkish and Sanscrit, and, I believe, with several other European and Asiatic languages, which I am not able to designate with accuracy. And creditable as is the acquisition of this mass of knowledge, the circumstances under which it has been effected render it still more meritorious; for besides the impediments to literary labor of a large household and a family of children, all the duties incident to which have been performed with exemplary fidelity, Mrs. Putnam has labored under the disadvantage of weak eyesight, so that for years she did not open a book, but was forced, in the study of several languages, to rely wholly on the aid of read-

ers and amanuenses, who in some cases did not understand a word of what they were assisting her to acquire. The obstacles of this kind which her energy and perseverance have surmounted, were indeed full as great as those with which the historians, Augustin Thierry and Prescott, have had to contend, and her triumph over them deserves the same applause that has been so justly bestowed on theirs.

Mrs. Putnam's knowledge of the languages I have enumerated is not limited to the grammar and dictionary. She has made herself familiar, in many cases, with the literature and history of the nations by whom they are spoken; and of the result of her researches she has given some specimens, in a series of contributions to the *North American Review* and the *Christian Examiner*, written with a vigor of style and thought as creditable to her intellect, as the matters they treat of are to her learning and industry. To the literature and history of Hungary and Poland she has of late years given special attention, and her studies in this direction have been facilitated by an acquaintance with eminent scholars of those countries resident among us, and by the possession of a very fine collection of books in nearly all the languages of Europe.

With these qualifications for the task, Mrs. Putnam accepted the challenge which Mr. Bowen, in the *North American Review*, had offered to the public on the subject of his articles on Hungary. She replied to him in the most thorough manner, in the *Christian Examiner*, and demonstrated to the satisfaction of everybody who has read her reply, that he had pretended to knowledge on the subject which he did not possess, and that he had greatly misrepresented the Hungarians and their cause. By a skilful analysis of his first article, she proved that it was based altogether on the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, and that even that *Revue*, hostile as it is to the Hungarians and to Freedom, afforded no true ground for the monstrous accusations and misrepresentations of the "War of Races." She showed that the respectable and reliable authority, Degerando, the title of whose work he had placed at the head of his article, was not used at all in its preparation, so that really "there is not a statement of fact or opinion in the article which can be attributed to M. Degerando; and the greater part of it is in direct contradiction to the statements of that author." She showed also, that Mr. Bowen's articles contained contradictory statements on points materially affecting his argument, and that he had himself mentioned facts, the admission of which

completely overthrew the conclusions he was laboring to establish. She pointed out the cause of these inconsistencies, so singular in an article drawn entirely from one shallow source, which cause was, that Mr. Bowen's zeal against the Hungarians had outrun even that of the French writers from whose partisan essays he drew his materials, so that his anti-Hungarian theories were much more extreme than theirs, and were so far from being supported, that they were actually contradicted by some of the facts which they had furnished and he had quoted. She proved, in fine, in the most conclusive manner, that Mr. Bowen's articles were inaccurate, illogical and unjust, to such a degree that it might literally be said of them, "that there is hardly a sentence in which an error is not either expressed or implied."

This was proved, too, not by Magyar testimony, as Mr. Bowen sneeringly asserted in a subsequent rejoinder, but by the authorities to which he had himself referred, and whom he had expressly endorsed as respectable and trustworthy. It may be remarked also, that this overwhelming refutation of Mr. Bowen's mistakes and fallacies was performed without one word of personality or harshness, with a rigid attention to all the punctilios of decorous controversy, and in a style which for moderation, dignity and power, formed a striking contrast to that of the articles on which she was commenting. Her reply was not less remarkable for power of reasoning and strictness of logic, than for profound and varied learning.

MR. BOWEN'S REJOINDER.

Mr. Bowen attempted to reply to Mrs. Putnam, and to some of his newspaper critics, by two Letters in the Boston Daily Advertiser. The first of these letters consists chiefly of a sketch of himself and his position, intermixed with denunciation of those who have criticised him in the public journals. It exhibits a sensitiveness to criticism not to have been looked for in the editor of a critical review, whose profession for years has been to expose and castigate the literary misdoings of others, and who has not been remarkable for the forbearance or good nature with which he has exercised that profession.

A few specimens will suffice to show the style and temper of this first letter. The Boston

Transcript and the New York Tribune are spoken of as *not respectable papers*; and Mr. George Ripley, of the Tribune, is described as "*a former Clergyman of Boston, who long ago abandoned his profession and his faith, to wander in the wilds of infidel socialism.*" Mr. Bowen says of himself, that against him "*a grand crusade of the Coalized Democratic and Freesoil parties has been invoked, that they might obtain possession of the government of the State, for the express purpose of depriving him of an honorable appointment, exclusively literary and educational in its character, which he held, and thereby of despoiling him and his family of their daily bread*"—a statement which affords an entirely original if not very satisfactory solution of the political revolution in Massachusetts, and affords also a tolerably fair notion of Mr. Bowen's peculiar mode of viewing contemporary history.

His second Letter is devoted exclusively to Mrs. Putnam's article in the Christian Examiner. He says that he has read that article "with astonishment and profound regret. It is not merely written in a sneering and offensive tone throughout, but its apparent object is not so much to defend the Hungarians, as to damage the character of the Reviewer, by insinuating, and even openly declaring, that his object was to undertake the defence of Austria." Mr. Bowen makes no attempt to substantiate by quotations this unjust description of the tone and object of Mrs. Putnam's article, but proceeds, by way of retort, to assert that she "admits more for Austria—claims more for Austria than I have ever admitted or claimed." He says that she "even praises the Austrian policy," and has a better right than he to be called "an apologist for Austria." To prove this he quotes two expressions from Mrs. Putnam's article, pages 448-49, which may reasonably be presumed to be the strongest he could find. They are these: "*The Austrian Government is not more than any other, entirely independent of Public opinion.*" "*Among the reforms proposed by the liberal party in Hungary, there were doubtless some which were viewed with less disfavor than others by the Austrian government, and which, under certain conditions, it might not be indisposed to promote.*"

Mr. Bowen must have held in slight estimation the intelligence of his readers in the Daily Advertiser, or must have relied strongly upon the haste with which newspaper articles are commonly read, when he ventured to quote the above sentences, as involving "praises of Austrian policy," and proving that their writer is ever more than himself an "apologist for Austria."

He must have known that it might with truth be said of the government of Rome, under Nero or Caligula, or of the governments of Dahomey or Morocco, under their worst tyrants, that "they were not, any more than any other, entirely independent of public opinion." No government has yet existed among men entirely independent of public opinion. As for the second sentence, it is difficult to discover in it any "praises of Austrian policy," especially when the force of the qualifying phrase, "under certain conditions," is considered. There is probably no government so corrupt, or so adverse to improvement, that it might not be disposed to promote some reforms under certain conditions, particularly if those conditions were manifestly to its own advantage.

It is clear, then, that Mr. Bowen's charge against Mrs. Putnam, that she praises the Austrian policy, and is an apologist for Austria, is not at all justified by the quotations which he brings to support it. This would have been still more evident, had not Mr. Bowen, with his usual unfairness, omitted to give the whole of the passages from which he made his quotations. In the first instance which he cites, Mrs. Putnam, so far from defending the Austrian government, was actually exposing the fallacious nature of Mr. Bowen's defence of it. He had said, in the *North American Review* for January, 1850, page 108:—"It is much to the credit of the Austrian government, that although Széchenyi was the leader of the constitutional opposition in the diet, it adopted nearly all his projects of reform, and submitted them under the form of royal propositions to be discussed in both houses." Upon this Mrs. Putnam remarked:—"The Reviewer founds his opinion of the disposition of the Austrian government in regard to reform, upon the nature of the royal propositions offered to the diet. This argument is wholly fallacious. *The Austrian government is not more than any other, entirely independent of public opinion*; and in Hungary especially, it has always been forced, in appearance at least, to pay a certain regard to the wishes of the nation. By affecting to take the initiative in reform, by offering to the consideration of the diet some of the questions which occupied the attention of the nation, the Austrian government effected a double purpose; it allayed the excitement of the nation by apparent concession, and secured for itself, with the ignorant and short-sighted, the credit of proposing measures whose success it was at the same time regarding and thwarting by every expedient."

In the second instance, Mrs. Putnam's language was this:—"Among the reforms proposed by the liberal party in Hungary, there were doubtless some which were viewed with less disfavor than others by the Austrian government, and which, under certain conditions, it might not be indisposed to promote. But under these conditions, they would be less serviceable than dangerous to Hungary. Thus, the contest in the diet often concerned, not simply the adoption of the measure proposed, but the conditions under which it should become law. For example, with regard to the taxation of the nobles, Austria could have no objection to their taxing themselves at their pleasure, if the Austrian government was to have the command of the revenues thus raised; but the Hungarian nobles, while they were ready to contribute money for the service of their country, refused to do so to strengthen the hands of its enemies. They insisted that if the nation subjected itself to taxation, the diet of the nation should have a voice in the disposition of the funds thus contributed."

It will be perceived from this, that Mr. Bowen detached from their proper connection the sentences which I have italicised, and held them up as proofs that Mrs. Putnam had praised the Austrian policy and was an apologist for Austria, when it was perfectly obvious that the whole tenor of her argument was just the other way. What renders this attempt to misrepresent Mrs. Putnam still more inexcusable is, that Mr. Bowen, as if confident that his misquotations had demonstrated that Mrs. Putnam was guilty of gross injustice towards him, assumes a tone of injured innocence, and indignantly declares that "this is not a point of ordinary misrepresentation, or of wresting words from their proper meaning; it is a question of simple truth or falsehood." Mr. Bowen is right. It is evidently a question of simple truth or falsehood, and it is equally evident that the falsehood does not rest with Mrs. Putnam.

Mr. Bowen goes on to say, "Of course, I immediately formed the opinion, which was only strengthened by perusal of the remainder of the article, that it was not written by the person whose initials it bears, and who was unwarily lent the sanction of a highly respectable name to statements and language furnished by another." This gives us some insight into the process by which Mr. Bowen "forms his opinions." He had not the slightest reason for supposing that Mrs. Putnam did not write the article. He knew that she had furnished to his own *Review* several articles of equal learning

and ability ; and he knew, moreover, that she was incapable of accepting the credit of an article which she did not write. He should have known, also, that in proceeding upon this injurious assumption, he was rendering himself liable to the imputation of being ready to insult Mrs. Putnam, without being ready to incur the responsibility of doing it in a direct manner.

Mr. Bowen next says : "The hardihood or recklessness of assertion which I have exposed in this instance, pervades the whole article. I should say that it had been prepared by one who had a profound knowledge of the Magyar language, and a profound ignorance of history and every other subject." The "instance" to which Mr. Bowen refers in this insolent style, is that of "praising the Austrian policy," in which, as I have already shown, the "hardihood or recklessness of assertion" belongs to him alone.

Succeeding this, is a string of sneers at Mrs. Putnam's knowledge of the Magyar tongue, and the consequent advantage it gives her in writing of Hungarian history. The logic of this portion of his letter, and indeed Mr. Bowen's logic generally, may be judged of by a single passage. He says : "On the same principle we must declare that no one shall write about the history of America who has not a thorough knowledge of Choctaw." In thus comparing the Magyar to the Choctaw—the language of a great and cultivated people, with the dialect of a few thousand savages—Mr. Bowen must have known that he was making a comparison which was no comparison at all. A knowledge of the Magyar is obviously of the highest value in writing of the recent history of Hungary ; a knowledge of Choctaw is not needed for the history of America. The passage will serve to illustrate both Mr. Bowen's mode of reasoning, and the candor with which he has treated Mrs. Putnam.

It is not difficult to point out the cause of the bitter aversion which Mr. Bowen entertains towards the Magyar language, and the indignation which he has repeatedly expressed in the *North American Review*, as well as in the *Daily Advertiser*, at Mrs. Putnam's presumption in making herself acquainted with it. In his first article, the "War of Races," he laid great stress on a passage in the Hungarian Declaration of Independence, in which something was said about "the ancient and received principles which have been recognized for ages," which according to Mr. Bowen's interpretation, meant "acknowledging the absolute supremacy of the

Magyar race in the country which they conquered, and where they have been lords of the soil and the dominant nation for eight or nine centuries."—[*North American Review*, vol. lxx, p. 82.] Mr. Bowen made a great point of this, which in fact was the only piece of evidence to be found in his article—his quotations, from French Magazines being, of course, no evidence at all. Mrs. Putnam quietly disposed of the whole thing, by showing that there was no such passage in the Declaration, but that it was an interpolation of the person who translated the document from the Magyar into English, who had taken the word *fonebbi* (*above*) to mean *former* or *ancient*, and had paraphrased it accordingly. The demolition of the structure he had reared on this passage, has given Mr. Bowen a strong disrelish for the Magyar language in general, and especially for the word *fonebbi*, to which he has never since alluded without evident disgust and vexation.

MR. BOWEN'S EIGHT POINTS.

The main portion of Mr. Bowen's Letter is devoted to the consideration of *eight* points in the former history of Hungary, concerning which, as Mrs. Putnam proved, he had shown himself to be incorrectly informed ; which points he himself characterizes as among the "common and notorious facts of history." Her object in exposing his ignorance in these particulars, was to show, that as he was grossly mistaken about well known and long settled points of Hungarian history, he was not likely to be accurate with regard to comparatively obscure and confused passages. That portion of the letter in the *Daily Advertiser* which contained the discussion of these Eight Points, appeared subsequently in the *North American Review* for January, 1851, pp. 241-2-3-4-5.

The *first* of these points Mr. Bowen states and defends as follows :

"The Examiner sneers at me for representing Ferdinand I. as claiming to be rightful sovereign of Hungary, in quality apparently of descendant from his wife, after I had admitted that the Hungarian crown at this period was elective. Dr. Robertson says that he *did* claim the crown, and that 'this claim was founded on a double title ; the one derived from the ancient pretensions of the house of Austria to both kingdoms ; the other from the right of his wife, the only sister of the deceased monarch ;' and in the very next sentence he admits that the

crown was elective. Archdeacon Coxe asserts the same fact, in almost exactly the same language. The Examiner's sneer, therefore, is directed against these two historians."

This is all that Mr. Bowen says on the subject, and leaves the uninformed reader to suppose that the matter is settled by the reference to Coxe and Robertson, and that Mrs. Putnam stands opposed to two respectable historians. Now let us see what the passage was on which Mrs. Putnam was commenting. It may be found on page 97 of the North American Review for January, 1850. Speaking of the Hungarians, it says, "Ferdinand I. of Austria, had become their rightful sovereign after the death of the unhappy Louis II., whose sister he had married, and whose right was of course transmitted to her descendants." The apparent meaning of this is, as Mrs. Putnam justly remarked, that Ferdinand became rightful King of Hungary, in quality of descendant from his wife; which involved not only an absurdity in expression, but in point of fact, for he became King by election, and not by right of his wife, who had no right at all to the throne, for, as Mr. Bowen had himself expressly stated on the same page, the female line had at that time no claim whatever to the Hungarian crown, nor indeed for nearly two hundred years afterwards. Mr. Bowen, however, quotes Dr. Robertson, and refers to Archdeacon Coxe, to prove that Ferdinand *did* claim the crown. Mrs. Putnam did not deny his claim, but denied Mr. Bowen's assertion that on the strength of that claim he became rightful King of Hungary. The truth of the matter, and the nature of Mr. Bowen's mode of making quotations and references, will be understood by the following passages from his own authorities. The first is from Robertson's Charles V., Harper's edition, page 219 :

"As Lewis was the last male of the royal family of Jagellon, the Archduke Ferdinand claimed both his crowns. This claim was founded on a double title; the one derived from the ancient pretensions of the house of Austria to both kingdoms; the other from the right of his wife, the sister of the deceased monarch. The feudal institutions, however, subsisted both in Hungary and Bohemia in such vigor, and the nobles possessed such extensive power, that the crowns were still elective, and Ferdinand's rights, if they had not been powerfully supported, would have met with little regard."

Various considerations, none of which had reference to the claim of his wife, "at length secured Ferdinand the throne." Dr. Robertson says, "though a considerable party voted for the vayvode of Transylvania." It is evident

from this passage, of which Mr. Bowen quoted only a portion, that Robertson, so far from sustaining the statement in the North American Review, really controverts it.

The case may be briefly stated thus. Mr. Bowen asserted that Ferdinand I. became *rightful* King of Hungary in right of his wife, who was sister to King Louis II. Mrs. Putnam remarked that Mr. Bowen had himself admitted that the Hungarian crown at that period was elective, and consequently Ferdinand could not have become rightful King by right of his wife, who, of course, had no hereditary right to an elective crown, and who, besides, was excluded by a law which rendered females ineligible to the sovereignty of Hungary. Mr. Bowen replies, that Robertson and Coxe support his assertion, and by a garbled extract from Robertson shows that, according to that historian, Ferdinand *claimed* the crown in right of his wife—as if claiming the crown were the same thing as receiving it, or being rightfully entitled to it. In the very passage which Mr. Bowen partially and unfairly quotes, Robertson expressly states that the crown was *elective*, and that Ferdinand was chosen king for other considerations than his marriage with the sister of Louis.

But Mr. Bowen refers to Archbishop Coxe, the historian of the House of Austria, in proof that his assertion was correct. Here is the passage to which he refers:—Hist. of House of Austria, Bohn's ed., vol. i., p. 496.

"Louis being the last male of his family, Ferdinand claimed both crowns under a double title; the one derived from family compacts, which secured the reversion to the House of Austria in failure of male issue to the reigning family; and the other in right of his wife, Anne, the only sister of the deceased monarch. But the natives of Hungary and Bohemia were too much attached to their right of election to respect these compacts, or even to acknowledge his claims as husband of the princess; and Ferdinand prudently waiving his pretensions, offered himself as a candidate, according to the usual mode of election."

Here we have it distinctly stated that the natives of Hungary not only refused to acknowledge the Austrian's claims in right of his wife, but that Ferdinand *waived his pretensions*, and "offered himself as a candidate, according to the usual mode of election." Mr. Bowen ventured to quote a detached portion of Robertson's statement of this matter, but he prudently contents himself with referring to Coxe, without quoting him. I will also remark here, as a very significant fact, that in none of these quotations or references does Mr. Bowen mention the

page or volume, thus rendering it impossible for his readers to follow and verify his authorities, except by a laborious search through perhaps several voluminous works. The reason of this unusual omission is apparent enough to those who have taken the trouble to hunt up the passages to which he appeals, or which he pretends to quote.

Having shown by the very authorities to which he himself referred, that Mr. Bowen was wrong in the *first* point, which he contested with Mrs. Putnam, let us consider the second. He states it thus:—[*North American Review*, p. 242.]

“We had asserted that ‘after the memorable scene with Maria Theresa, this right [of the House of Hapsburg to reign in Hungary] was extended, according to the terms of the Pragmatic Sanction to the female line.’ The Examiner objects, that ‘if this right had not been extended to the female line in the lifetime of Charles III., father of Maria Theresa, the memorable scene could never have taken place.’ The ignorance here displayed is almost incredible. Charles the Third lived seven or eight centuries before Maria Theresa was born. Charles the Sixth (as he is called by all historians except the Magyars) who was her father, had indeed persuaded the Hungarians nominally to accept the Pragmatic Sanction, some twenty years before the scene, just as most Sovereigns of Europe had done, who broke their pledge immediately after the death of Charles, just as the Hungarians were expected to break theirs. Of course the female line was actually established on the throne only by the success of the queen’s appeal to the Hungarian Diet.”

In Mr. Bowen’s own language it might be said that the *disingenuousness* here displayed is almost incredible. He pretends to believe that Mrs. Putnam had confounded Charles the Sixth of Germany who lived in the 18th century, with Charles the Third, who lived in the 9th century. Now he knew very well that Mrs. Putnam meant Charles the Sixth of Germany, though she preferred, very properly, to use his Hungarian title in writing of Hungarian history. The proof that he knew this, is contained in the sentence which he has put between brackets—“Charles the Sixth, (as he is called by all historians, except the Magyars),” which shows that Mr. Bowen was aware that the Magyars did not call him Charles the Sixth, and that Mrs. Putnam in styling him Charles the Third, was using his Hungarian title. Consequently he knew that his rude charge of “almost incredible ignorance” was without foundation, and was a gratuitous insult to Mrs. Putnam.

In transferring this passage from the Boston Daily Advertiser to the North American Review, Mr. Bowen added the following

note [N. A. Rev. Jan. 1851, p. 243] which establishes beyond question his unfairness in this matter:

“The overweening national pride of the Magyars appears even ludicrous, when manifested through their obstinate determination not to recognize their sovereigns except under the appellation by which they were known in the annals of Hungary, though they were universally known by a different title throughout civilized Europe. Grave complaints were made by Magyar writers, and even by the Magyar Diet, because their late sovereign *would* style himself Ferdinand I., while they persisted in calling him Ferdinand V. What common reader would recognize the Second James of England under his Scotch title of James VII.?”

I have copied the whole note. It will be seen that Mr. Bowen distinctly avows his knowledge that the Hungarian sovereigns were known by a different title in the annals of Hungary from that which they bore in the annals of Germany, and therefore, though he may think what he pleases of the propriety of using the Hungarian title, he is fully aware that its use does not display “almost incredible ignorance” and consequently his charge of such ignorance against Mrs. Putnam, and his pretended belief that she confounded Charles III. of Hungary with Charles III. of Germany, can only be characterized as a spiteful and untruthful fling at that lady.

Mr. Bowen’s intense hatred of the Hungarians, and his “obstinate determination” to misrepresent them, is strikingly manifested by his ascribing to “overweening national pride, which appears even ludicrous,” their persistence in calling their sovereigns by a national title, instead of a foreign one. It may be that Mr. Bowen does not know, but certainly every man who has read history to any considerable extent, knows that all nations situated as the Hungarians have been, have acted like them in this respect. They would have been false to themselves if they had not. Charles I. of Spain became, by election, Charles V. of Germany, and by the latter title he was, and still is universally known throughout civilized Europe. Yet the Spanish nation persisted and persist in styling him Charles I., when speaking of their own history. And in Scotland, previous to the legislative union with England, the Scottish nation continued to speak of their sovereigns by the national, instead of the English title. In the Scottish Parliament and in all public documents James I. and James II. of England were always mentioned as James VI. and James VII. It was a mark of independence and nationality, which was guarded with just anxiety. Mr. Bowen’s

inquiry, "what common reader would recognize the second James of England under his Scotch title of James VII.?" is worded with that ambiguity upon which he frequently relies to cover up his fallacies. He does not state under what circumstances or conditions he supposes James to be mentioned. If he were to write on a blank sheet of paper the words "James the Second," or "James the Seventh," certainly, no reader, common or uncommon, could tell who was meant. But if in writing the history of Scotland, James VII. were mentioned, it would be a very uncommon reader who did not recognize James II. of England; while if the monarch in question were mentioned simply as James II., the second James of Scotland, who lived two hundred years before him, would be understood.

Mr. Bowen's reference to the Hungarian Diet and to Ferdinand I. or V., is founded altogether upon a passage in Paget's Hungary and Transylvania, a work which Mr. Bowen justly characterizes as "excellent and impartial," and from which he quotes largely in the course of his articles. I copy the passage, because it contains a clear statement of the case, and because it will serve to illustrate Mr. Bowen's mode of dealing with the "authorities" to whom he so confidently refers:

"The bill now brought up from the Deputies, and to which the degree of importance attached by all parties, appeared ridiculous to a stranger, had reference to the appellation of the new king, and was to settle whether he should be addressed as Ferdinand the First or Ferdinand the Fifth. *The matter, however, was not so unimportant as it may appear; the fact is, he is Emperor Ferdinand the First of Austria, and King Ferdinand the Fifth of Hungary; and unless Hungary had ceased to be an independent country, which the greatest courtier would not dare to insinuate, there could be no question as to his proper title.* The Magnates, however, thought otherwise; it was understood that the Court desired that the style of Ferdinand the First should be used, and the Magnates were too anxious to please, not to desire the same thing. The Deputies had now, for the fourth time, sent up this same bill, insisting on the title of Ferdinand the Fifth; and for the fourth time the Magnates were now about to reject it. Two or three short speeches were made in Latin, the Palatine seemed to sum up the evidence in the same language, and the question was declared decided. As we afterwards heard, it was in vain the Court party exhausted their breath and servility in favor of what they supposed the Court would wish. At the moment when the Magnates were as firm as rocks on the wrong side, the Court took the wise course of showing its contempt for such supporters by sending down a proclamation — 'We, Ferdinand the Fifth, by the

grace of God, King of Hungary,' &c.—*adopting of its own accord what it knew to be right, and perceived to be the general wish, leaving the odium of having opposed it to its blind satellites.*—[Paget, ch. vi. vol. 1, pp. 175, 6, 7, Am. edition.]

From this passage Mr. Bowen has manufactured his sneering remark, that—"Grave complaints were made by Magyar writers, and even by the Magyar Diet, because their late sovereign would style himself Ferdinand I., while they persisted in calling him Ferdinand V."

In support of his assertion, that "after the memorable scene with Maria Theresa, the right of the House of Hapsburg to reign in Hungary was extended, according to the terms of the Pragmatic sanction, to the female line"—Mr. Bowen says:—[*North American Review*, p. 243.]

"Archdeacon Coxe, who is followed by Professor Smyth, when speaking of the preparation for the scene in 1741, says 'the grey-headed politicians of the Court of Vienna in vain urged that the Hungarians, who, when Charles the Sixth proposed the Pragmatic Sanction, had declared that they were accustomed to be governed by men, and would not consent to a female succession, would seize this opportunity of withdrawing from the Austrian domination. But Maria Theresa formed a different judgment and her opinion was justified by the event.'"

Mr. Bowen prudently omits to indicate in what part of Coxe's extensive work this passage is to be found. It occurs on page 269 of vol. 3 of Bohn's edition, not far from the middle of chapter 101. It really has nothing whatever to do with the question. The fact is, according to Coxe himself, that Maria Theresa made no appeal whatever to the Hungarian Diet on the subject of her right to the throne. Her right to the throne had been solemnly recognized by the Hungarian Diet, nearly twenty years before. The Hungarian nation acquiesced in that recognition; it made no opposition to her accession, but on the contrary, as Coxe expressly says, vol. 3, p. 268, she, "at her coronation, had received from her grateful subjects the warmest demonstrations of loyalty and affection." And yet Mr. Bowen quotes from the *very next page* of Coxe, to prove that "of course the female line was actually established on the throne only by the success of the queen's appeal to the feelings of the Hungarian Diet!" He might as well have said that Mr. Fillmore was actually established in the Presidency only by the good reception of his first message to Congress. Maria Theresa's appeal was for military aid—for men and money. She had been treacherously attacked by nearly all the neighboring

nations, including, among others, France, Prussia, Bavaria, and Saxony: her dominions were invaded on all sides by powerful armies, and in this "wholly desperate" condition, as Coxe says, "Vienna menaced with an instant siege, abandoned by all her allies, without treasure, without an efficient army, without able ministers," she threw herself on the generosity of the Hungarian Diet, not for confirmation of her right to the throne, for that they had already confirmed, but for means to carry on the war. The Hungarians nobly responded. They voted large supplies of men and money; they rose in arms with enthusiasm, thirty thousand volunteers marched to the relief of Vienna, and Austria was rescued from imminent destruction. The passage from Coxe which Mr. Bowen quoted so confidently, was a rhetorical flourish about the doubts which "the grey-headed politicians of the Court of Vienna" had entertained as to the success of her appeal—and nothing more. Professor Smyth, as Mr. Bowen acknowledges, follows Archdeacon Coxe in his account of the matter; and that account is in both of them, wholly against the statement which Mr. Bowen refers to them as sustaining, and fully justifies Mrs. Putnam's criticism of that statement.

The *third* point which Mr. Bowen contests with Mrs. Putnam, he states in this manner:—
[*North American Review*, p. 243.]

"The Examiner, in referring to a statement of ours, says that 'the confirmation of the union with Austria, or to speak more accurately, the confirmation of the House of Hapsburg, on the Hungarian throne, by the act of the Diet of 1687,' could not have contributed to the release of Hungary from the Turks in 1683. Of course it could not; but according to Coxe and all other historians (except the Magyars) the union with Austria was in fact confirmed as early as 1567."

Mr. Bowen does not here, *as in other parts of his rejoinder*, quote the passage from the *North American* on which Mrs. Putnam was commenting, but merely alludes to it as "a statement of mine." I do not know why in this instance he departed from his usual practice, but I know that if he had quoted his own words, it would have been evident to his readers that Mrs. Putnam's criticism was perfectly just. He said—*North American Review*, Jan., 1850, page 97—that "Hungary made choice, so long as her monarchy remained elective, of the Emperor of Austria to be her king, and finally, in a Diet held at Presburg, in 1687, acknowledged the hereditary right of the same family

to reign in both countries." This acknowledgment was, of course, the confirmation of the House of Hapsburg on the Hungarian throne. Yet Mr. Bowen, after thus fixing the date of the "union with Austria" in 1687, in the *North American Review* for Jan., 1850, says in his letter to the *Daily Advertiser* and in the *North American* for January, 1851, "according to Coxe and all other historians, it was confirmed, as early as 1567." To support his new theory, Mr. Bowen quotes three or four lines from Coxe—vol. 2, p. 49—about John Sigismund, stating that Sigismund "engaged not to assume the title of King of Hungary, except in his correspondence with the Turks, and to acknowledge the Emperor as king, his superior and master,"—which has nothing whatever to do with the matter. Coxe really confirms Mr. Bowen's first statement, the one in the *North American*, Jan. 1850, as may be seen by reference to vol. 2, pages 450, 1, 2, chap. 66, in which, after narrating the victories over the Turks in 1687, he says:

"In the midst of these successes, Leopold completed his long meditated design of *rendering the crown hereditary*. * * * * Notwithstanding the wretched state of Hungary, and the humiliation of every foreign power from whom the natives could expect assistance, they adhered with singular pertinacity to the mischievous, though darling privilege of electing their monarch; they employed every subterfuge, and offered every expedient, to save a right which they considered as the palladium of their liberties. When all the threats, bribes, or concessions of Leopold could not extort their consent to render the succession hereditary in the female line, he prudently yielded to their prejudices. The states agreed to the coronation of Joseph as an *hereditary sovereign*, and confirmed the *succession* in the males, both of the German and Spanish branches; but still reserved to the nation the right of election on the extinction of the male line."

This was in 1687, when, and not in 1567, the House of Hapsburg was admitted to hereditary possession of the Hungarian throne. It follows therefore, from Mr. Bowen's own authority, and from that of Archdeacon Coxe to whom he refers, that he was wrong, and Mrs. Putnam right in the *third* point.

Mr. Bowen states the *fourth* point thus:—
(*N. A. R.*, p. 244.)

"The Examiner goes on to affirm that 'the Turks were not driven out of Hungary in 1683; neither were they driven out by Sobieski, though the reviewer seems so well satisfied of this fact.' We had tolerably good reasons to be satisfied of it, if Coxe, and every other English, French, and German historian, who have written the history of this period, are to be trusted."

I do not understand what could have induced Mr. Bowen so confidently to assert that his statement is supported by all German historians, when he had before him, on the very page of the *Christian Examiner* from which he was quoting, Mrs. Putnam's reference to *three* German histories, in proof that his statement was incorrect. Nor do I understand how, if he examined all the German historians of that period, as his remark would imply, he could have overlooked that passage in so accessible a work as Menzel's *History of Germany*—vol. 2, p. 495, of the English translation—in which it is stated, that after Sobieski had "returned to Poland—Charles of Lorraine, aided by Lewis of Baden, carried on the war during the ensuing year, and attempted to regain Hungary." Of course, if Hungary had been already regained by Sobieski, Charles of Lorraine would not have attempted to regain it. Menzel, in the very next sentence, expressly says, "the Turkish commandants and garrisons retained possession of the Hungarian fortresses, and offered a brave and obstinate resistance." It is evident, then, that all the German historians do not support Mr. Bowen's assertion, that Sobieski expelled the Turks from Hungary. Neither do all the English historians, as I shall now proceed to show from that very work of Archdeacon Coxe, to which Mr. Bowen so frequently refers. It is true that Mr. Bowen quotes a passage from Coxe, which, to a careless reader, might seem to prove the contrary, though no person who had read the book, or had it before him, could possibly be misled by it. This passage states that, after Sobieski had defeated the Turks at Vienna and at Parkan "*the Turkish army, continuing their flight to Belgrade, abandoned Hungary.*"—Hist. House of Aus., vol. 2, p. 449. This refers merely to that particular Turkish army which Sobieski had routed, and which he pursued only to Gran, the nearest Turkish fortress in Hungary, in the capture of which he participated with Charles of Lorraine, the German commander. The reason why the Turkish army retired to *Belgrade* was, not that they were pursued thither, but that the Grand Signior himself was there awaiting their return—a fact which Mr. Bowen's favorite authority, Coxe, does not mention, but which may be found on p. 275, vol. 2, of Knolles' *History of the Turks*, continued by Sir Paul Rycaut, abridged by Mr. Savage, London, 1701, or in Rycaut's own ponderous folio. A few days after the fall of Gran, which took place in October, Sobieski set out for Poland, and on

the 24th of December, or about two months afterwards, he and his army were in winter quarters at Cracow, having in the meantime performed a toilsome march of two hundred miles, across the snows of the Carpathian mountains. See Fletcher's *Hist. of Poland*, Am. ed., p. 111. Sobieski never returned to Hungary.

Gran is more than 200 miles from Belgrade, and the Turks continued to hold the intervening country, as they had held it for a century and a half, having pashaws in the principal cities and garrisons in all the fortresses. They were expelled from it gradually, in the course of two long and bloody wars, the last of which terminated in 1718, with the treaty of Passarowitz, by which the Turks relinquished their last possessions in Hungary. The proof of this from Coxe is, that on the same page from which Mr. Bowen took the above quotation, mention is made of the Turkish bashaw of Great Waradin, an important Hungarian city, at a period considerably subsequent to Sobieski's departure; and on the next page, it is stated that "the surrender of Cassan again threw the principal parts of northern Hungary into the power of the emperor;" and the capture of Buda is recorded, the ancient Hungarian capital, which the Turks had held for 157 years. Buda is only 26 miles from Gran, and was not taken till 1686, three years after Sobieski's departure. Still further, on page 458, v. 2, Coxe states that by the treaty of Carlowitz, the date of which was 1699, Austria regained "all Hungary north of the Marosch, and west of the Teiss;" which still left a considerable province in possession of the Turks. The recovery of this province, which is known as the Bannat, is stated by Coxe, vol. 3, p. 403, to have taken place in 1718. This proof from Mr. Bowen's favorite authority will, I suppose, be sufficient to establish the truth of my remark, that all English historians do not support his statement. But if more evidence be needed, I offer that of the *Encyclopedia Americana*, which was mostly taken from the German, and was edited by a German scholar whose knowledge of history will not be questioned, and who may reasonably be supposed to be well informed upon that of Austria. In the article on Hungary, vol. 6, pages 475–6, it is stated, that civil commotions "delayed the expulsion of the Turks, in which Leopold I. finally succeeded so far that he retook Buda, 1686, and, by the peace of Carlowitz, 1699, recovered the rest of Hungary, *except the Bannat.*" "The Congress of Passarowitz, 1718, restored the Bannat to Hungary."

It is evident, therefore, that Mr. Bowen was mistaken in asserting that the Turks were driven out of Hungary in 1683 by Sobieski, and that "Coxe, and every other English, French, and German historian, who have written the history of this period" supported his assertion; and Mrs. Putnam's criticism was of course correct.

Mr. Bowen states his *fifth* point thus:—[*North American Review*, p. 244.]

"We had said that 'in the final struggle, the noted Tekeli and his partisans fought with the Turks against Sobieski;' for proof of which, see Coxe and all other historians (except the Magyars) *passim*. The Examiner *seems* to deny this, by asserting that 'Sobieski was already dead at the time of the final struggle,' which it fixes in 1716; while on the authority given above, we placed it in 1683."

It will be seen that Mr. Bowen's *fourth* and *fifth* points are essentially the same; for Mrs. Putnam did not mean to deny, nor does she, to a candid reader, even *seem* to deny that Tekeli fought with the Turks against Sobieski. She merely intended to dissent from Mr. Bowen's assertion that Sobieski and Tekeli fought in the *final struggle*; which dissent, I think, is not without justification from the fact, that the final struggle took place when the former had been dead twenty years, and the latter more than ten; which renders it improbable that either of them fought in it, notwithstanding Mr. Bowen's reference to "Coxe and all other historians." To prevent misapprehension, it may be as well to remark that Mrs. Putnam gives 1716 as the date of the final struggle, because the last great battle was fought in that year; the treaty by which the Turks abandoned Hungary being dated two years later.

Mr. Bowen, it will be noticed, repeats his assertion that the expulsion of the Turks from Hungary took place in 1683. Mrs. Putnam maintained, Ch. Ex. page 431, that he was mistaken, and that it took place in 1718. I have brought sufficient proof that Mrs. Putnam was right. Mr. Bowen, however, in defending his *fifth* point, in his Letter to the Boston Daily Advertiser, quoted a passage from McCulloch's Universal Gazetteer, (Vol. i. p. 1145) where it is said, (speaking of the Hungarian nobles) "so great was their antipathy to the Austrian yoke, that in 1683 they rose, with Tekeli at their head, and called upon the Turks to relieve them from servitude. Austria, however, succeeded by the help of John Sobieski and Prince Eugene, in expelling the Turks from these countries, &c." This

quotation apparently sustains Mr. Bowen's assertion that the date of the Turkish expulsion was 1683, and does not sustain Mrs. Putnam's counter-assertion that it was 1718. I have copied the quotation exactly as it stands in Mr. Bowen's Letter. The reader will notice that it closes with a comma, after which Mr. Bowen puts, &c. Would any one have thought that the sentence which followed that comma, and which completed the passage thus partially quoted by Mr. Bowen, was this—"and they were finally secured to it by the treaties of Carlowitz and Passarowitz in 1718."

The character of this transaction is easily understood. Mr. Bowen has a controversy with Mrs. Putnam about the date of an important event in history. He states one year as the date, and she states another. He finds in McCulloch's Universal Gazetteer, or Geographical Dictionary, a passage in which both dates are mentioned—the date for which Mrs. Putnam contends being given as that of the event in question, while the other is introduced as the date of a totally different event. Mr. Bowen quotes that portion of the passage which contains the date for which he was contending, and stopping at a comma, suppresses the sentence which proves the truth of Mrs. Putnam's position!

Soon after the appearance of Mr. Bowen's Letter in the Daily Advertiser, I reviewed it in the Boston Atlas, and exposed in nearly the foregoing manner, the true nature of this quotation from McCulloch. Mr. Bowen saw this exposure of his peculiar mode of quoting authorities, and in copying his Reply from the Daily Advertiser into the North American Review, he omits the mangled quotation which he had made from the first volume of McCulloch, and substitutes this passage from the second volume—(speaking of Turkey under Solymán the Magnificent):

"At this period the Turkish empire was unquestionably the most powerful in the world. Nor had this mighty power even then reached its greatest height. Solymán was succeeded by other able princes, and the Ottoman arms continued to maintain their ascendancy over those of Christendom until in 1683, the famous John Sobieski, King of Poland, totally defeated the army employed in the siege of Vienna. This event marked the era of their decline."

Mr. Bowen explains the substitution of the one passage for the other by the following note:—[*North American Review*, p. 245.]

"In a former publication of this paragraph, in a newspaper, in place of the sentence here cited from McCulloch, another sentence, which

was quite irrelevant, was accidentally substituted by a mistake of the copyist."

This statement has, of course, all the weight that belongs to the word of a man who has occupied the respectable post of Professor of History in Harvard University. But it is so exceedingly unsatisfactory, that I am compelled to declare I cannot give it implicit belief. It does not seem likely that a copyist would make such a mistake as to substitute a passage from one volume, for a greatly different passage in another volume. Nor do I understand how such a mistake could escape correction. Mr. Bowen, it is said, read his letter to some of his friends in Cambridge before he sent it to the Advertiser. Why did he not then detect the mistake? Why did he not detect it when reading the proof? Or did he, a Professor of History in Harvard University, send long historical articles to the press, without examination or revisal, and that, too, concerning matters in which his intelligence and accuracy had been publicly impeached? And why did he let the mistake go uncorrected for a month, when a note of a dozen lines, to the editor of the Advertiser, would have rectified it, instead of waiting till his unfair quotation had been exposed in the newspapers? Why, too, did he pretend to refute Mrs. Putnam by quoting against her the passage from the second volume of McCulloch, without making any reference to the passage in the first volume which was so decisive in her favor? He, of course, must have read both of these passages, or he could not have pointed them out to his copyist.

But the consideration which to my mind is most decisive against the probability of the alleged mistake, is this: The question at issue between him and Mrs. Putnam was about *Tekeli and the expulsion of the Turks from Hungary*. Now there is not a word about Tekeli or Hungary in the second quotation from McCulloch. It is altogether irrelevant, and merely says, what no one ever denied, that in 1683 Sobieski defeated the Turks before Vienna; which "event marked the era of their decline," McCulloch says, meaning their apparent decline, for their real decline began with Lepanto. Sobieski's victory, instead of being the "final struggle," was only the first blow in the expulsion of the Turks from Hungary. That expulsion was accomplished by Prince Eugene in 1718, when Sobieski had been dead more than twenty years. But the first quotation, which Mr. Bowen says is "quite irrelevant," and was "accidentally substituted by a mistake of the copyist," does

mention Tekeli and does speak of the affairs of Hungary. It was, in fact, the most relevant to his purpose that could have been found, if, unfortunately for Mr. Bowen, the last clause of the sentence, which he suppressed, had not completely refuted the apparent meaning of the portion which he copied. The question was when, and by whom, were the Turks expelled from Hungary. Mr. Bowen said, in 1683, by Sobieski. Mrs. Putnam, and all historians say in 1718, by Prince Eugene. And now, to give the finishing stroke to Mr. Bowen's quotations from McCulloch, I will complete his *second* extract from that author, by adding its *conclusion*.

"The Ottoman arms continued to maintain their ascendancy over those of Christendom until, in 1683, the famous John Sobieski, King of Poland, totally defeated the army employed in the siege of Vienna. This event marked the era of their decline. *For a while they continued to oppose the Austrians and Hungarians with doubtful fortune and various success; but the victories of Prince Eugene gave a decisive superiority to the Christians.*"—[Vol. ii. p. 977.]

Perhaps *this* was omitted "accidentally"—"by a mistake of the copyist"!

Mr. Bowen states his *sixth* point thus:—[N. A. R., p. 245.]

Commenting on our assertion that the Turks held possession of nearly half of Hungary for a century and a half after Ferdinand came to the throne, the Examiner says: 'this then was the protection which the Hungarians found *from their enemies* in the union with Austria;' and again, 'Austria neither protected the Hungarians from the Turks, nor suffered them effectually to protect themselves.' This is really too bad. During the whole period in question, the greatest part of the Magyars were not the enemies, but the active allies and friends of the Turks, against the Christian powers of Europe; their leaders, John of Zapolya and his posterity, and Tekeli and others, could not have kept up the contest with Austria for a month, except by the aid of the infidels.

This is not a fair statement of Mrs. Putnam's position. Mr. Bowen in the North American Review [Jan. 1850, p. 97] had said, in order to demonstrate the value to Hungary of the Austrian connection, that since the battle of Mohacs, in 1526, the Hungarians "have found protection from their enemies [the Turks] only by their union with Austria." He also stated, that for a century and a half after the battle of Mohacs, the Turks had possession of full half of the kingdom, although before that battle the Hungarians had repeatedly driven them back, and protected not only Hungary, but the rest of Europe from their incursions. Mrs. Putnam commented on these inconsistent state-

ments, and said very truly, "Austria neither protected the Hungarians from the Turks, nor suffered them effectually to protect themselves. It was when their armies were commanded by Austrian generals, and their cities filled with Austrian garrisons,—it was when Austrian misgovernment and falsehood had divided the nation against itself—that the Hungarians were forced to submit to the Turks." Evidently, Mr. Bowen's *sixth* point is not more defensible than the others. He asserted that the Hungarians found protection from the Turks only by their union with Austria. Mrs. Putnam replied that by his own statement the Turks had possession of half the kingdom for a century and a half after the accession of the Austrian dynasty, whereas, previous to that accession the Hungarians had protected not only their own country but the rest of Europe from them. It is true, that during that century and a half, the Hungarians frequently fought with the Turks against the Austrians, but it was because they invariably experienced better treatment from the Turks than from the Austrians. The infidels granted them religious toleration, while the Catholic House of Austria sought to extirpate their national Protestant faith by cruelties unparalleled in Europe since the days of Domitian and Nero. If anything more is needed to be said on this point, I will cite the authority of M. Degerando, one of the most accurate and intelligent of the writers on Hungary, who, on page 9 of his valuable work *de l'Esprit Public en Hongrie*, after remarking that Austrian intrigues had divided and enfeebled the country from even the time of Hunniades, but that the Turks could effect nothing against it under the Magyar Kings, says—

"Even after the battle of Mohacs, Sultan Solyman quitted Hungary without retaining possession of a single village. When he again invaded Hungary the country was under the dominion of the Austrian Ferdinand, so that it may, with strict truth, be said that the Turks who could not conquer Hungary from the Hungarians, conquered it from the Austrians. If for a hundred and fifty years the Pashaws encamped on the soil of Hungary, it was owing to the policy of Austria."

It will be seen that the statement of Degerando is identical with that made by Mrs. Putnam, which Mr. Bowen affects to consider "really too bad."

Mr. Bowen's *seventh* point is stated in this way, N. A. R. p 245:—

"The Examiner objects to our calling both John Hunniades and his son, the almost equally renowned Corvinus, *kings* of Hungary, by say-

ing that the former was *not* a king, but only 'governor of Hungary.' He was a king in fact, though not in name, just as Charles Martel and Pepin were really kings of France, though nominally only mayors of the palace. Gibbon does not hesitate to speak of the *reign* of Hunniades, in the same sentence in which he alludes to 'the titular king, Ladislaus of Austria.'"

Had Mr. Bowen quoted the whole of the passage in Gibbon, to which he refers, it would have been apparent to his readers that Mrs. Putnam was right in her criticism, for Gibbon explicitly says, not that Hunniades was *king*, but that he was *supreme captain and governor of Hungary*. The passage is near the middle of the 67th chapter of the Decline and Fall, and is so short that I can see no good reason for Mr. Bowen's not quoting it. "During the absence and minority of Ladislaus of Austria the titular king, Hunniades was elected supreme captain and governor of Hungary; and if envy at first was silenced by terror, a reign of twelve years supposes the art of policy as well as of war." This is very far from supporting Mr. Bowen's distinct assertion that Hunniades was *king* of Hungary—on the contrary, it refutes it. Gibbon evidently used the word *reign*, in this place, as a synonym of *administration*, without intending to convey the idea of royalty. Mr. Bowen's remark that Hunniades was "a king in fact, though not in name," is not to the purpose. It might be properly said that Richelieu and Mazarin were kings of France, "in fact, though not in name;" but the writer who, in treating of French history, should speak of "those renowned *kings*, Armand de Richelieu and Julius Mazarin," would be commonly held to have made a ridiculous blunder. It may be remarked also, that in speaking of Corvinus as "almost equally renowned" with his father, Hunniades, Mr. Bowen betrays an ignorance of European history which could scarcely have been looked for in a person holding the professorship of history in Harvard University. King Matthias Corvinus was, in every respect, greater and more renowned than his father.

Mr. Bowen's *eighth* and last point is of little consequence. He states and defends it thus, N. A. R. p. 245.

"We once used the abbreviated expression 'Emperor of Austria,' instead of the more common phrase, 'Emperor of the House of Austria.' Of course the former expression is just as correct as the latter; for the sovereigns in question were emperors (of the Holy Roman Empire) an appellation which had become merely titular for more than a century before Francis resigned it, so that they were usually designated by adding the name of their hereditary dominions."

This is not an entirely accurate statement of the case. In the *North American Review*, Jan. 1850, p. 97, Mr. Bowen asserted "that Hungary made choice, so long as her monarchy remained elective, of the Emperor of Austria to be her king." Upon which Mrs. Putnam remarked that "there were no Emperors of Austria during the period that the Hungarian monarchy remained elective, nor for more than a hundred years afterwards. This title did not exist until the present century. It was assumed in 1804, by Francis, in anticipation of the loss of that of Emperor of Germany, which he resigned in 1806." Mrs. Putnam was, of course, correct, and Mr. Bowen's expression was inaccurate, though, I presume, the inaccuracy was owing to carelessness, rather than to ignorance. But in his reply, Mr. Bowen falls into another inaccuracy, in saying that the common phrase for the sovereigns in question, was "Emperor of the House of Austria," during the century that preceded the resignation of Francis. They were commonly known as Emperors of Germany.

I have now considered all the points in which Mr. Bowen attempts to reply to Mrs. Putnam, and I have shown, chiefly from his own authorities and references, that in every case Mrs. Putnam was right, and he wrong. I have also shown that he has misrepresented Mrs. Putnam, and perverted her language, in order to make out that she "praised the Austrian policy"—that he has charged her with "incredible ignorance," when by the terms of his own statement, it is evident that he knew she was not ignorant—and that to convict her of injustice to him, he has referred to authors as if they sustained him, when he could not, by any degree of carelessness, have failed to see that they really supported her; and that, furthermore, he has made quotations to prove that she was wrong, suppressing portions of those quotations which proved that she was right.

Let me now ask the reader's attention to the following passage from Mr. Bowen's Letter to the *Daily Advertiser*:

"I have now considered *all* the specifications in the charge of blundering in my statements of historic facts, and can safely leave the reader to form his own opinion of them. One of two conclusions must be true:—*Either the Examiner is grossly ignorant of the most notorious facts stated by the most common historians, or it has deliberately forged historical statements in order to damage my reputation, and deprive me of office, thinking that a bold and confident utterance of them might cause them to pass as truths with the ignorant, the malicious, or the unwary;—*

a hope in which, so far as the editors of the *Times*, the *Transcript* and the *Tribune* are concerned, it has not been deceived. This is strong language, I confess; but in view of all the circumstances attending this gross attack upon my character, subsistence, and even personal safety, I leave it to the public to judge if it be not fully deserved."

This, it will be observed, contains a direct charge against Mrs. Putnam, of having "deliberately forged historical statements" in order to damage Mr. Bowen's reputation, and deprive him of office,—the office of Professor of History in Harvard University. It is true, that Mr. Bowen makes this atrocious charge under cover of an alternative; but it is equally true that that alternative has nothing whatever to do with the matter. Whether Mrs. Putnam be "grossly ignorant" or not grossly ignorant, could have no effect on the deliberate forgery of historical statements with which he charges her, thinking, I suppose, that "a bold and confident utterance of the charge might cause it to pass as truth with the ignorant, the malicious, or the unwary."

This, then, is the position in which Mr. Bowen has placed himself with regard to Mrs. Putnam. He has utterly failed in attempting to refute her courteous exposure of his mistakes in Hungarian history, and in making the attempt, he has grossly misrepresented her meaning, perverted her language, and has made the most unfair quotations, to cover up his blunders and convict her of ignorance and injustice; and then, after all this, he turns round and indignantly charges her—a lady of distinguished learning and ability, and of the highest social standing—with having deliberately forged historical statements, in order to damage his reputation, and deprive him of office!

MR. BOWEN'S LAST ARTICLE AGAINST HUNGARY.

As I have already stated, Mr. Bowen has copied into the *North American Review* for January, 1851, the principal portion of his Reply to Mrs. Putnam, which first appeared in the *Boston Daily Advertiser*. He has added nothing to his Eight Points except a note on the persistence of the Magyars in styling their king Ferdinand *Fifth* instead of *First*, and another note, explaining the "mistake of the copyist" in the matter of the quotations from McCulloch, both of which notes I have considered above. In this last article, Mr. Bowen speaks

of his first one,—the “War of Races”—as a “plain and inoffensive statement of historical facts concerning a nation upon the eastern confines of Europe, with whom our countrymen had had no political, commercial or literary relations whatever, and of whose history they might fairly be presumed to know as little as they did of the early annals of China.”

This passage, which is otherwise of no importance, deserves notice as an illustration of the peculiar recklessness with which Mr. Bowen makes assertions, and of his disregard for accuracy, even when inaccuracy can be of no service to him. Hungary is not a country upon the eastern confines of Europe. It is exactly in the centre of Europe, with regard to east and west; and, in fact, approaches a little nearer to the western, than to the eastern boundary of Europe. The statement that we “had had no political, commercial or literary relations whatever with Hungary,” is intended, I presume, as an assertion that when Mr. Bowen wrote his first article, we had no accessible means of information about that country. But for several years we have had all the political relations with Hungary that any nation, except Austria, can have; that is, we have maintained an embassy at the Court of the Hungarian King. Indeed, the political intercourse between our government and that of the Empire of which Hungary is the most important part, began at a very early stage of our national existence, as may be seen from Mr. Webster’s Letter to the Chevalier Hulsemann. Our commercial relations with Hungary, it is true, have been very slight, but as for our literary relations with that country, if by the term, Mr. Bowen intends means of information, we had them in abundance long before he began to write his articles. Bowring’s Poetry of the Magyars is a well known book, the works of Paget and of many other English travellers, could be found in our libraries, while every large geographical work contains an account of Hungary, in some cases a very good one, like that of McCulloch, which is as long as an ordinary article in the North American Review, and furnishes statements which completely refute Mr. Bowen’s conclusions. Nearly every English journal of note had published elaborate articles on the subject before his “War of Races” appeared, and that essay, as I have previously stated, was derived altogether from the most widely circulated of French periodicals, *La Revue des Deux Mondes*. In fact, his assertion, that of the history of Hungary, our countrymen “might fairly be

presumed to know as little as they did of the early annals of China,” although it may be true of Mr. Bowen himself, when he began to write on the subject, is not true of those among us—and their number is not few—who have studied general history more than is needed for the getting-up of a review article; nor is it consistent with Mr. Bowen’s own statements elsewhere. For, in attempting to reply to Mrs. Putnam’s exposure of his blunders in Hungarian history, he says he shall “confute them by references to such authorities as are in the hands of everybody,—to pages with which a schoolboy may be supposed to be familiar.” These authorities he enumerates as Gibbon, Robertson, Coxe, Professor Smyth and others. Others, in Mr. Bowen’s peculiar style, simply means McCulloch, from whose Geographical Dictionary he makes some extracts, the character of which I have shown above. Now Gibbon, Robertson, Smyth and McCulloch have all been republished and widely circulated in this country, while Coxe’s House of Austria has long been a standard work for libraries, and for some years past could be obtained in a cheap form at almost any bookstore in our cities. If these, then, are “good authorities for the History of Hungary,” (*N. A. Review*, Jan., 1851, p. 241,) and are “in the hands of everybody,” even of “schoolboys,” what becomes of the dense ignorance which Mr. Bowen assumes to have existed on the subject?

Mr. Bowen omits in the North American, the atrocious charges of “falsehood” and “forgery,” and of making a “gross attack upon his character, subsistence, and personal safety,” which he dealt out so vehemently against Mrs. Putnam in the Daily Advertiser, though he has not the sense of justice, to make the least retraction or apology for them—unless their silent withdrawal, in this second edition of his reply, may be construed as an acknowledgment that he is conscious of his error. But even in this better-considered article, his language is not free from offensiveness. He still persists in his absurd sneers at Mrs. Putnam’s knowledge of the Magyar language, and again affirms that her article “appears to have been written, not so much for the purpose of explaining the nature of the war in Hungary, as for that of damaging the reputation of the only American writer who has dared to plead the cause of ten millions of oppressed and down-trodden Slavonians, Wallachians,” &c.

He says, for instance, on p. 240 :

“The character of the whole article, which is nearly seventy pages long, may be inferred with

sufficient accuracy from a single statement in it, which we copy as a curiosity, for it is certainly one of the most astounding assertions on record. The only facts alleged in immediate confirmation of it, are those which we have already considered in a foot-note on page 226: '*Since the reign of St. Stephen, all the races inhabiting the kingdom have composed the Hungarian nation, and have shared equally in all its honors and all its sufferings.*' — Christian Examiner for November, 1850, p. 466.

"We have no doubt, whatever, that the writer fully believed this marvelous statement at the time of making it. It only shows how far one may be misled by a little pardonable vanity, arising from the consciousness of having acquired some knowledge of the Magyar language, a very rare, if not unique accomplishment for one not born in Hungary, and by implicit reliance on a single, but very untrustworthy source of information."

It is not necessary to comment upon the good taste of Mr. Bowen's allusion to Mrs. Putnam's knowledge of the Magyar language, nor upon his logic in attempting to refute a historical statement by sneering at the "vanity" of the person who has made it. The justice of his imputation of "implicit reliance on a single source of information" (he means the Magyar) may be comprehended from the fact, that Mrs. Putnam's article contains extracts from every book or writer referred to by Mr. Bowen himself in the "War of Races," and that it is chiefly by his own authorities that she refutes him. She quoted besides from a number of German authorities, and scarcely at all from Magyar writers.

The passage from Mrs. Putnam's article on which Mr. Bowen lays such stress, needs no defence to any one who is tolerably well acquainted with the history of Hungary, and I do not understand how, if Mr. Bowen has read one half of the books he quotes from or refers to, he can have any doubt whatever of its truth. In the North American Review for Jan. 1850, pp. 90, 91, he said:

"The *present* position of the Magyars in Hungary is very much what that of the Normans in England was, for the first century or two after the conquest. . . . To break the spirit of the conquered Saxons by the insults as much as by the losses inflicted upon them, to proscribe their language as well as to rob them of their estates, to ridicule their habits, and to brand them as an inferior and degraded race, who were unfit to hold office, and unworthy to bear arms, was the settled policy of the earlier Norman kings."

Mrs. Putnam, commenting on this ridiculous passage, said very truly [Ch. Ex. Nov. 1850, pp. 466-7]:

"We have already shown that no such condition of things as that supposed by the Reviewer, has existed in Hungary for at least eight hundred years. Since the reign of St. Stephen, all the races inhabiting the kingdom, have composed the Hungarian nation, and have shared equally in all its honors and all its sufferings. Was then this state of things introduced in the Spring of 1848, when the Hungarians obtained a virtual independence of Austria? Did the Magyars seize this occasion to exclude their fellow countrymen from the privileges of citizenship? Were the other races branded at that time, as inferior and degraded, and declared unworthy of bearing arms and of holding office? The first officer commissioned by the Hungarian ministry, at the commencement of the insurrectionary movement in Croatia and Slavonia, was the Slavonian Hrabowszky; in the first battle which was fought in the late war, the Hungarians were commanded by the Wallachian Moga; one of the most distinguished of their generals was the Servian Damianich; when sentence of expulsion from the throne had been pronounced on the house of Hapsburg, the first act of the independent nation was to confer the highest office in the State upon the 'Slovac' Kossuth."

Mr. Bowen, it will be seen, compares the *present* position of the Magyars in Hungary with that of the Normans in England for the first century or two after the Conquest; and by inference, compares the condition of the Slavonians, Wallachians, &c., to that of the conquered Saxons, who were branded as an inferior and degraded race, unfit to hold office, and unworthy to bear arms. Mrs. Putnam demolishes this most absurd statement by a simple reference to the well known facts that Hrabowsky, Moga, Damianich and Kossuth, none of them Magyars, held high military and civil offices during the late war—a war which Mr. Bowen maintains to have been on the part of the Magyars, nothing but a struggle to keep the other races in an oppressed and degraded condition, from which enlightened and liberal Austria was fighting to relieve them. In one of the above quotations, Mr. Bowen says he has "considered in a foot note on page 226," these facts about the elevation of Kossuth, Moga, &c.

Now, let us see in what manner he has "considered" them. Hrabowszky, he says, "is nearly allied to Count Zichy, one of the most influential Magyar nobles in Hungary!" Mr. Bowen does not condescend to explain how a man of an "inferior and degraded race," came to be "nearly allied to one of the most influential Magyar nobles." "The Wallachian Moga," he says, "Kossuth deposed immediately after that *first* battle, and put Georgey, a Magyar

noble, in his place." Mr. Bowen means—if he means anything, except to throw dust in the eyes of his readers—that Moga was deposed because he was a Wallachian, and Georgey put in his place, because he was a Magyar, without any reference to the military talents or conduct of the two generals. But how came Moga to be appointed, and permitted to fight the first battle of the war, if the race to which he belonged was "deemed inferior and degraded, and unworthy of holding office?" That is the question, and Mr. Bowen's pretended answer to it, is simply an insult to the common sense of his readers. Schlesinger, from whom he got the fact, says (vol. i., p. 81):

"Moga exposed his troops in this engagement in an unpardonable manner; and the main body of the Magyar army would have been lost, had not the retreat been ordered in time. On this occasion, the great talent of Kossuth displayed itself; with a keen penetration and discernment, possessed only by men of highly-gifted natures, he detected among thousands the man worthy to take the future command of the army. It was Georgey who first directed Kossuth's attention to the faulty tactics of Moga. Kossuth raised Georgey to the rank of General upon the field of battle, and invested him with the command the following day."

Kossuth and Damianich, Mr. Bowen says, were Magyarized nobles, and, "as is usual with renegades, were more fanatically Magyar than the Magyars themselves"! He makes no attempt to explain how these men of "inferior and degraded races" came to be Magyarized nobles, and elevated to the highest offices of the State.

The fact is, that Mr. Bowen's position on this subject of races in Hungary is utterly and even absurdly wrong. I am at a loss to conceive how he could retain it for a moment, after reading the works from which he quotes. If indeed he has read them or any of them, he *must* know that he is wrong. He *must* know that the other races were not slaves or serfs to the Magyars, or even politically oppressed by them. There was formerly a noble class and a peasant class in Hungary—the noble class having great and exclusive privileges. But there were millions of Magyar peasants and tens of thousands of nobles of Slavonic and Wallachian race. By a series of legislative acts, urged on by the nobles themselves, in many cases against the opposition of the Austrian government, and extending over a period beginning with 1832 and ending with 1848, the exclusive privileges of the nobles were relinquished, and the peasants raised to a perfect equality with them be-

fore the law. So far were the Croats from being oppressed, that they in fact had peculiar privileges above even the Magyars, as I shall show hereafter.

I cannot better illustrate the absurdity of the articles in the North American than by supposing a parallel case, which I think will exactly match that of Mr. Bowen, and will also illustrate his mode of reasoning. I will suppose a Hungarian Reviewer as prejudiced against this country as Mr. Bowen is against Hungary, and that in the course of his profound researches, he has discovered that our white population consists of several distinct races, speaking different languages, viz.: the Anglo-Saxon, the Dutch in New York, the Germans in Pennsylvania, the French in Louisiana, and the Irish everywhere. He takes it into his head that the Anglo-Saxons, known also as Yankees and as Americans, which latter title they sometimes "arrogate to themselves," as Mr. Bowen says the Magyars do that of Hungarians, oppress and degrade the other races, and do not allow them to hold office. To substantiate this position, he quotes from English travellers, to show what an uncivilized, vainglorious, grasping, domineering race the Americans are. He quotes from Knickerbocker's History of New York, and from Irving's other works, from Paulding's novels, from jest books, and from the speeches of the St. Nicholas Society, abundant proof that the Dutch mortally hate and abhor the Yankees, and that the Yankees defraud and oppress the Dutch. He refers to the Anti-Rent disturbance, as an illustration of the way in which the Dutch peasantry are trampled on by their aristocratic tyrants, and relates how their struggle for freedom was crushed by the Yankee militia, led by an Anglo-Saxon officer, the sheriff. He quotes from documents and newspapers, to show in what a state of profound ignorance the Anglo-Saxons have kept the Germans of Pennsylvania, and how deeply they have loaded them with public debt in order to debase and crush them, at the same time "daring to boast themselves as the friends of education and advocates of equal laws." He quotes all that has been written, so far as it will suit his purpose, about the dislike entertained by the French of Louisiana to the Americans, and the annoyance they have experienced from the restless, ambitious and improving spirit of the latter people. He refers to the most authentic works to prove that some time ago—he takes care not to specify the precise period—these French were dissatisfied with the American yoke, and

were inclined to hail the British as deliverers; and details the high-handed proceedings of the American General, Jackson, who kept them down by *terrorism*, proclaiming martial law and imprisoning all who opposed him. He relates also, in this connection, with a convenient omission of dates, the pathetic history of the Acadians, who were expelled from their homes by a Yankee force led by a Yankee commander, Colonel Winslow.

To show how the Irish are oppressed and debased, he copies descriptions of their mode of life in the cellars and garrets of our great cities; he analyzes public documents, to prove that vast numbers of them have been consigned to jails and workhouses, by their relentless Yankee masters; he cites passages from newspapers, to show how ruthlessly their convents have been burnt at midnight by Yankee mobs, and how the same haughty oppressors have shot them down in the streets of Philadelphia, and sacked and destroyed their churches and dwelling-houses. He culls from Native American speeches and articles everything tending to prove what a deep hatred exists between the races, and how determined the aristocratic Americans are to keep the Irish in subjection. Finally, he mixes up these quotations with extracts from works by Smith, Brown and Jones, from pamphlets and newspapers, all proving conclusively that the Pequods were exterminated, the Cherokees deprived of their lands, the Seminoles hunted with bloodhounds, the Tories tarred and feathered, the cow-boys and skimmers hung, the Mormons persecuted, and the Nullifiers, (whom he takes to be a distinct race,) ground to the earth and goaded to rebellion by unjust revenue laws, enacted by the domineering Yankees. To demonstrate the oppressed and degraded condition of South Carolina, (the American Croatia,) he cites the speech of Mr. Rhett in the United States Senate, Dec. 16, 1851, in which it is emphatically declared that "the tyranny of this government over the South is more ruthless than that of Austria which enslaved Hungary."

He proves, in the same way, by judicious quotations, that Major Andre was executed as a spy; that Joe Smith was shot at midnight by a band of Anglo-Saxon assassins; that Gen. Lingan was murdered by a Baltimore mob; that Washington was an ambitious rebel, so parsimonious that he sold his old war-horse when his campaigns were ended; and that Gen. Taylor was a blood-thirsty ruffian, who hunted Indians with dogs, and whose only order on the

battle field, was, "Give 'em hell, boys!" [See N. A. Review, pp. 224-5-6-7, Jan. 1851, where Mr. Bowen expatiates on the atrocities of the Magyars and the savage and vile character of their leading generals and statesmen.]

The Hungarian reviewer might then triumphantly appeal to his bewildered readers, and exclaim, almost in the words of Mr. Bowen — "Behold this formidable array of authorities! I have summoned into Court a crowd of reputable and unimpeached witnesses, professing all forms of political doctrine, whose united and harmonious testimony can leave no doubt upon a mind of ordinary capacity. I have merely used their language instead of my own. Since the fall of the aristocracies of Venice and Poland, the Yankees in America, with few exceptions, have been the most arrogant, cruel and tyrannical nobility in the world. I have proved that their leaders were corrupt and merciless, and that the other races of their country were deemed inferior and degraded, and unworthy of holding office." And if some better informed person should civilly enquire — "If this last statement of yours be true, how did it happen that Jackson, of the Irish race, and Van Buren, of the Dutch race, were elected Presidents, while Soulé, of the French race, was admitted to the Senate, and Muhlenberg, of the German race, was sent Ambassador to our own Court at Vienna?" — the Hungarian Mr. Bowen might reply, as his American prototype has done — "I do not deny your facts — but I will explain them — I will 'consider' them. Jackson was allied by marriage to an influential Anglo-Saxon family. Van Buren was 'deposed' at the end of his first term, and the Anglo-Saxon Harrison put in his place. As for Soulé and Muhlenberg, they were completely Americanized, and as is usual with renegades, were more fanatically American than the Americans themselves!"

This may be deemed by those who have not examined the subject, an extravagant caricature of Mr. Bowen's articles on Hungary. But having carefully read the principal books from which he quotes and misquotes, I can confidently affirm that it is not exaggerated. The sketch of the imaginary Hungarian reviewer's opinion of this country, contains in proportion to its length, more facts and fewer false inferences than Mr. Bowen's statements about Hungary. The reader can judge for himself whether there be any difference between the logic of the two reviewers so far as Kossuth, Moga, &c., on the one side, and Jackson, Van Buren, &c., on the other, are concerned.

MR. BOWEN'S ANTI-HUNGARIAN AUTHORITIES.

The "formidable array of Authorities" referred to above, forms the main portion of Mr. Bowen's last article on Hungary, and consists of a confused mass of extracts from "English, French, German and Hungarian writers," comprising, I believe, about seventy distinct citations, strung together without explanation or comment. These extracts, which Mr. Bowen calls "a formidable array of authorities," are chiefly taken from anonymous pamphlets—from Austrian documents whose falsity has been fully exposed by the English press—and from books long ago published, relating to a condition of things that had ceased to exist in Hungary, years before the war began. The titles of *ten* English and German books are prefixed to the article—*four* of these were published at Vienna, in 1849 and 1850, subject to the most rigid censorship, and while the city was in a state of siege—*another* appeared at Presburg in 1849, under the candid and impartial sanction of Haynau and his martial law; and of the remaining five, *two* are anonymous; *one* is by a notorious Austrian partisan, Count Mailath; and another was published in London eleven years ago, is a work of no authority whatever, and so far as Mr. Bowen quotes it, does not say a word about races, or relate at all to the recent condition of Hungary. One only of the ten works, that of Schlesinger, is of any value, and the quotations from that are so perverted by omissions that they convey, or seem to convey the very reverse of what the author intended; and the same thing is true of the quotations from most of the other respectable works whose titles are not included among the ten: for Mr. Bowen quotes from several books whose titles he has not prefixed to his article.

Prominent among these "authorities" is "*Hungary: its Constitution and its Catastrophe. By Corvinus.*" Corvinus is a great name in Hungarian history; it was the surname of the famous Hunniades and of his still more famous son, king Mathias Corvinus. Doubtless, many of Mr. Bowen's readers were familiar with the name, and doubtless some of them have supposed that "Corvinus," was a well-known and respectable Hungarian authority. I have heard of one or two who thought so. Mr. Webb, of the N. Y. Courier and Enquirer, who has, without acknowledgment, made use of Mr. Bowen's quotations as if he had himself read the books from which they are taken, speaks of "the historian Corvinus," as if he were some well-known

writer. Mr. Bowen relies greatly on Corvinus. He makes thirteen extracts from him, which cover six or seven of his thirty pages. And what does the reader suppose this work to be? It lies before me as I write—an anonymous pamphlet, with a green paper cover, written by some English scribbler, who took "Corvinus" as a *nom de plume*, as one would take "Junius," or "Brutus," or "Publicola," or O. P. Q., or X. Y. Z. It may be written by an Austrian agent, by an Englishman in the Austrian service (there are hundreds in the army), or by some paid advocate of Metternich or Haynau. The thing is too contemptible for serious notice, but I will give one illustration of the way in which Mr. Bowen has used even this "authority." Mr. Bowen's theory is, that the late war in Hungary was a struggle on the part of the Hungarian nobles to maintain their ancient constitution, and the dominion which it gave them over what he calls their serfs and subject races, the Croats, Slavonians, Wallachians, &c., and that there was nothing republican about it. It is to sustain this theory that he has arranged his quotations, as well from "Corvinus" as from others. "Corvinus" himself, on the first page of his pamphlet, speaking of the Diet of which Kossuth was the leader, and which began the war, says:

"A spirit came over that Diet which no administrative reforms could satisfy—a spirit totally at variance with the genius of the Ancient Constitution, which established its ascendancy by *abrogating that constitution*, and sought to maintain it *by sacrificing the monarchy*. There can be no greater error than to suppose that the war of 1848-9 was a movement in defence of the time-honored institutions, which had their roots in the laws of St. Stephen and Andreas II."

In fact, the object of this anonymous pamphlet was, to render the Hungarian war unpopular in England, by showing that it was a republican and democratic movement.

Another of these "authorities" is an "Official List of 467 persons executed by the Hungarian Revolutionary Government," which was published at Vienna last year, in justification of the cruelties of Haynau and the other Austrian generals, and to throw odium on the Hungarians. The greater portion of it was translated and published in the London Times of Sept. 10th and 11th, 1850, under the title of the Magyar Bloody Assize, as a vindication of Gen. Haynau, after the attack upon him by Messrs. Barclay & Perkins's draymen. It was treated with contempt and ridicule by the English press generally, and its absurd falsities exposed in the most

triumphant manner. The worthlessness of the thing is transparent, as I can show, merely by making a few extracts. Mr. Bowen has filled two pages of the *North American Review* with quotations from it, carefully selecting those which would best bear examination. Some of the cases he has cited stand in immediate juxtaposition with the following, which I copy, word for word, from the *Times*, in every case giving the entire statement:—

“Gyika Marian was shot at Koratzintz on the 20th of October, 1848, *for attempting to strangle one of the insurgent magistrates.*”

“Gligor Stank, justice of Dulcse, Arad County, was shot *for hunting the lady of the manor with dogs through the forest, with intent to kill her or to do her some grievous bodily harm*” (!)

“John Kowatsch, Honved, [Hungarian soldier] of Worsce, County of Congrad, was hanged on the 7th of October, 1848, *for having assassinated one of his comrades*” (!)

“L. Hassinger, a Jew from Pèsth, was shot on the 3rd of June, for having, whilst acting as a spy to the rebel army, *betrayed their movements to the Austrian troops.*”

“N. Wuinow, a peasant, *was accused of having murdered a Hungarian spy.* He was shot at Palandy in April, 1849.

“Th. Stettin, a borderer, was shot *for mutiny by the orders of General Bem*” (!)

“A peasant, name unknown, was hanged at Verschetz, in May, 1849, *for killing one of the rebel Hussars*” (!)

“Stefan Doho and John Vorbasz, of Szgedin, were in February, 1849, tried and executed at Kanissa, *for murdering Major Tar of the Honveds*” (!)

Three-fourths of the list are of this character. The persons put to death were spies, traitors, and deserters, or were convicted of murder and other high crimes by the regular tribunals of the country. I have quoted some of the shortest instances I could find, passing over scores of cases nearly as absurd. Several of those enumerated in the list, were of persons who were killed by mobs, for which the Hungarian government was no more responsible than the English government was for the assault on Haynau. Others were cases of murder, by individuals which had nothing to do with politics; and in one instance an officer was classed among the “murdered,” because he was shot at and killed by the Hungarian skirmishers while marching in the Austrian ranks (!) A Captain Ottstadt was put in the same comprehensive category, because, having been taken prisoner by the Hungarians and released by the Austrians—“he died of cholera 24 hours after his return to his home” ! And from such a document as this, Mr. Bowen culls two pages of extracts to blast the reputation of

a gallant and unfortunate people, guilty of no crime but that of struggling manfully for freedom and liberal institutions, against the combined despots of Austria and Russia.

It would be tedious and superfluous for me to examine separately every quotation on Mr. Bowen's thirty pages, or to criticise each of his twenty “authorities,” with regard to most of which he prudently abstains from committing himself by vouching for their value, except by the general assertion that they are “reputable and unimpeached witnesses,” in which statement he includes the anonymous pamphleteer “Corvinus,” and the “official List” of Magyar atrocities. The writers whom Mr. Bowen specially endorses, either in the *North American* or in his letters to the *Daily Advertiser*, are Schlesinger, Pulszky, Paget, McCulloch, and De Langsdorff. I shall confine my examination therefore, to the quotations from these five writers, though the manner in which they are dealt with may serve as an index to the treatment of the rest.

Schlesinger is a Hungarian by birth, who has long resided in Berlin, and who has written in German a history of the war in Hungary. The English translation of this, from which Mr. Bowen quotes, was edited by Francis Pulszky, ex-Secretary of State to Ferdinand, king of Hungary, the late Emperor of Austria. Pulszky is a man of high character and ability, thoroughly conversant with Hungarian affairs, and to Schlesinger's work prefixed a valuable introduction, and added several notes, correcting the occasional inaccuracies of the text. Mr. Bowen's first quotation from Schlesinger is the following. [*N. A. Review*, Jan. 1851, p. 212.]

“The Magyar movement is widely distinguished, both by the power which called it forth and the object it had in view, from all the revolutions that convulsed Europe during the last two years. The political knowledge of the Magyars does not extend much beyond that of their own constitution; and it is remarkable with what singular affection and constancy this ancient constitution, with all its defects and abnormalities, has been held fast and cherished by the people. Whilst all the other nations have sought to enlarge more or less their representative constitutions, the Magyar has dreaded any change in his, clinging to its very letter, as the Mussulman to the words of the Koran.”

Mr. Bowen's purpose in quoting this, was evidently to make it appear that the Magyars were clinging with stupid bigotry to an old and defective constitution, simply because it was old, — and in fact, the passage, *as he has quoted it,*

offers no other interpretation. But how far such a construction would be from that intended by Schlesinger, will be seen by reading the continuation of Mr. Bowen's quotation, which is as follows: [Vol. 1, p. 114.]

"The cause of this lies, not so much in a belief of its excellence, as in the long struggles of the Constitutional principle *against the absolutist efforts of the Vienna Cabinet*; to oppose which the Magyars, in their Diet at Presburg, had no more effective weapon than the letter of their Constitution, ratified, as it has been, by the coronation-oath of every successive king. In this policy, the opposite parties in the Diet were agreed; indeed, for a long time past, it had been the safest, nay, the only possible course. The liberal Hungarian did not cling to his ancient Constitution as the free citizen of the United States does to his, *from a conviction of its excellence*, but because he knew that the concession of any single point would *strengthen the absolutist government in Vienna*."

The following is more elaborately mangled. It is from vol. II. pp. 88-9 of Schlesinger, and may be seen as quoted, on p. 232 of the N. A. Review.

"A far greater error, which must be laid to the charge of the Governor and his Ministers was the misapprehension of their task in reference to the question of nationalities. The Declaration of Independence had no meaning, unless the perfect satisfaction of all the wishes of the Croats, Serbs and Wallachs, followed immediately. The separation of Hungary from Austria ought at the same time to be a bond of union with the South Slavish races. That this was not easy of accomplishment, must be admitted; indeed it was extremely difficult to enter into any kind of peaceable and conciliatory relations with those nations. [Austria, moreover, *had cunningly prevented this, by placing its creatures at the head of the hostile races*. It had always been impossible to enter into negotiations with these men; Jellachich, Raiachich, Supliacz, Theodorovich, and the rest *had received far too decided orders, far too brilliant promises to allow this*. But seeing that an understanding with the leaders of the Slaves was impossible,—and knowing that *numerous voices among these races were beginning to raise the question of an alliance with Hungary*—the Government ought, [for this very reason] to have disarmed the power of the leaders, by issuing a proclamation, and at once conceding all the demands of the Hungarian Slaves, however exaggerated. No attempt ought to have been made to negotiate with the leaders, but the Diet should have addressed themselves directly with this explanation to the people. By such a step, the Declaration of Independence would have gained in significance and grandeur."

The sentences between brackets were omitted by Mr. Bowen, for very obvious reasons;—they stated the well-known truth, which he desired to suppress, that the opposition to the Hunga-

rians which existed among a portion of the Slavonic and Wallachian races, was fomented by Austria, whose creatures, Jellachich, Raiachich, &c., had been placed at the head of those races for that very purpose.

The next quotation from Schlesinger which I shall notice is fortunately a short one. [N. A. R. p. 217.]

"The Hungarian revolution comprehended all the elements of success—great statesmen, great generals, a great nation, and a country favorable to their arms. In the first French revolution the people had taken up arms *against* the king; here (at the commencement at least,) a nation had risen in support of their king. [The object was the same—freedom and independence; but in France the people were unsupported by the aristocracy, in Poland the aristocracy were unsupported by the people—here they both fought together.]" Vol. II., p. 223.

The portion which I have enclosed in brackets was omitted by Mr. Bowen, because it conflicted with his assertion that the Hungarian war was not a war for freedom and independence; and with his assertion that it was a struggle of the aristocracy to keep the people down; whereas Schlesinger, who is by far the best authority that Mr. Bowen quotes, says expressly, that unlike the case of Poland, the people and the aristocracy of Hungary fought together against the Austrians. Schlesinger's statement, that the Hungarian nation at the commencement rose in support of their king, alludes to the fact that the war began with Jellachich's invasion of Hungary, under *secret* orders from the Emperor-king, who, when interrogated by the Hungarians, denied that he had given such orders, and proclaimed Jellachich a traitor, upon which the Hungarians took arms in the name of the king, and drove Jellachich out of the country.

The next quotation from Schlesinger is equally decisive of Mr. Bowen's unfairness. [N. A. R. p. 231]:

"[The Hungarian Envoys at all the Courts started from the principle that, in their position they had only to deal with the existing Government; and Teleki always stood aloof from the parties in France, who were either at the helm of affairs or contending for power. This alone can explain the fact, that the Count was well received by all the successive ministries. His official notes were received, but their efficacy was crippled, *the reactionary party having gained the upper hand*, and] the French statesmen, under pretext of a dread of socialism, considering France not in a position to intervene. This party, under Lamartine, had already exerted their influence against Hungary, and the consequence was, that Pascal Duprat, who had in fact received his instructions from Bastide, as

agent in that country, did not leave France. In June, 1849, the affairs of Hungary took a better turn in the Elysée and the hotels of the ministers; but the overthrow of the party of the Mountain again destroyed all that the emphatic manifestations of public opinion had effected in favor of Hungary. The very circumstance that the socialists had taken part for Hungary was sufficient to determine the Conservatives against it. [*The Moderate party, and especially Mauguin, lost no opportunity of expressing their sympathy; but at the same time they would not hear of an intervention, from a dread of the Rouge party. The French Government, however, again summoned resolution; when the affairs of Hungary were prosperous, to send an agent to that country, as well as to protest energetically against Russian intervention.*"] Vol. II. p. 59.

The passages within brackets were suppressed by Mr. Bowen, apparently in the hope that some careless reader might suppose that the portion quoted sustained his ridiculous charge of Socialism and Red Republicanism against the Hungarians. Schlesinger's meaning was, that the French statesmen refused to interfere in favor of the Hungarians, not from want of sympathy, but because all their energies were required at home to keep down the Socialist party, which they had just overthrown, and which was yet very formidable. From that part which Mr. Bowen judiciously declined to quote, it will be seen that the Hungarian envoy, Count Teleki, so far from intriguing with or courting the Socialists, stood aloof from all parties, and was well received by all the successive Ministries. The Conservatives, of whom Schlesinger speaks, were the Royalists; but the Moderate party, which was Republican, though opposed to the Socialists, *lost no opportunity of expressing their sympathy with Hungary.* In fact, Schlesinger's true meaning was just the reverse of the apparent meaning of the passage which Mr. Bowen disingenuously tore from its context.

The last of Mr. Bowen's quotations from Schlesinger which I shall notice, is so long that I shall copy only the material portions of it, omitting some irrelevant passages about Georgey.—[N. A. Review, pp. 234-5.]

"The Parliament held secret conferences, to discuss the great question how the hostile Slavish and Wallachian races might be won over to the Magyar cause. The result was * * * a declaration of the equal rights of all nationalities, and an amnesty to all who had borne arms against Hungary, [28th July, 1849.] * * * But the recognition of equal rights came a year too late, for it now merely offered to the Slavish races a concession which had already been secured to them by the Emperor of Austria, and offered it moreover in the sight of their burnt

down cities, desolated villages, and desecrated graves."

To the sentence I have italicized, M. Pulszky affixed a note, saying that it was

"Incorrect; all the inhabitants of Hungary had, since March, 1848, possessed equal rights; the Diet only gave an amnesty for the Wallachs, Saxons, and Serbs, who were at this time all subdued by the Hungarians."

This note Mr. Bowen omitted, making no allusion whatever to it, and copied the incorrect statement in the text, because it served his purposes to have it appear that the Magyars had granted equal rights to the other races only in July, 1849, a few weeks before the war ended, when he must have known that, as Pulszky stated, all the inhabitants of Hungary had, since March, 1848, possessed equal rights. On page 234 of the N. A. Review is another quotation from Schlesinger, too long for me to copy, to which Pulszky affixed a note containing an important correction, which Mr. Bowen silently omits.

From Pulszky's preface to the Village Notary, by Baron Eötvös, Mr. Bowen quotes two or three paragraphs which he garbles in several instances by omitting passages unfavorable to Austria. I will copy the shortest instance.

"Baron Eötvös was the leader of a third party. He was imbued with the levelling tendencies of French liberalism. The men of Eötvös' school admired the theoretical perfection of Centralization, and vied with the Vienna party in their aversion to the county institutions, with their assemblies and elections. [But the Austrian Camarilla wished to establish the so-called 'Paternal Absolutism,' in the place of the county institutions; while the Eötvös party dreamed of a free parliamentary government.] His party considered Hungary as a *tabula rasa*, and they endeavored in defiance of history to raise a new political fabric," &c.

The passage within brackets Mr. Bowen suppresses.

Mr. Bowen's quotations from Paget are not any fairer than those from Schlesinger. The following is from the second volume of "Hungary and Transylvania," pp. 229-300, Am. ed. [N. A. R. p. 213.]

"[There seems, too, to be some idea among the *têtes exaltées* here, of an Illyrian nationality.] It is no uncommon thing to hear them reckoning up the Croats, Slavonians, Bosnians, Dalmatians, Servians, Montenegrins, and Bulgarians, and then comparing this mass of Slaves with the three or four millions of Magyars, and proudly asking why they should submit to deny their language and their origin because the Magyars command it. I am very far from wish-

ing this party success, though I cannot help in some degree sympathizing with a people who resist, when they think a stronger power is willing to abuse its strength by depriving the weaker of those objects—language and religion—which they hold as most dear. [No one can doubt how highly conducive it would be to the good of Hungary that Croatia should be made completely Hungarian; or that it is disgraceful to the age in which we live, that Protestants should be excluded from a whole country on account of their faith; yet indubitable as are these facts, it may nevertheless be very impolitic to seek to remedy them by violent means.] The act has passed, however, which declares that in ten years' time no Croat shall be eligible to a public office who cannot read and write the Magyar language, and the consequence has been, the creation of a feeling of hatred against the Magyars, which bodes but very ill for the speedy Magyarizing of the Croatian people. — [I have no doubt that some portion of this opposition is connected with Russian intrigue; for it is particularly strong among members of the Greek church, and it is so much the interest of Russia to weaken Austria, by disorganizing her ill-united parts, that we may be sure such an opportunity for the attainment of her object would not be lost.”]

The passages within brackets were omitted by Mr. Bowen. That at the beginning and that at the end are not of much importance; yet they should have been quoted—the first as showing that the boasts about the numbers of the Croats, Slavonians, &c., were not uttered by the people generally, but by the *têtes exaltées* of the small town of Agram, which Mr. Paget was then visiting; and the last, as expressing his opinion that this feeling of hostility to the Magyars was not altogether owing to the acts of the Hungarian Diet, but was in part produced by Russian intrigue. The passage in the middle, which Mr. Bowen suppressed, was, however, of essential importance; for in it Mr. Paget clearly expresses his opinion that it would be highly conducive to the good of Hungary, that Croatia should be made completely Hungarian. By Hungary, he means to include Croatia itself, which for eight centuries, has been a part of that country. Its peasantry spoke a dialect of their own, which till within a few years, had been wholly uncultivated; so that when Paget wrote, there were but three or four books in it. The people who spoke this dialect numbered only a few hundred thousands, and, of course, it was as desirable that the principal language of the country, the Magyar, which was spoken by millions, should prevail, as that that the English should prevail over the French in Louisiana, or over the German in Pennsylvania. The allusion to the exclusion of Protestants from Croatia is also very important, and I do not won-

der that Mr. Bowen was unwilling to quote it. It will be understood by the following passage from the same chapter of Paget, [vol. ii. pp. 296–7, Am. ed.], from which Mr. Bowen's extract was taken.

*“Croatia and Slavonia have the same laws and Constitution as the rest of Hungary, except in one or two particulars, in which they enjoy special privileges. * * * A case has lately arisen with respect to one of these privileges, which has given it a very uneaviable notoriety. It is the privilege of excluding all Protestants from the possession of property, and I believe of refusing them even the right of living within the boundaries of the two countries. This question has been mooted before the General Diet, and a more tolerant law passed; but as yet no change has been effected, for the Croats have refused to sanction or adopt it.”*

This is very significant. More than one-half of the Magyars are Protestants, nobles as well as peasants, and indeed Protestantism is known in Hungary as the Magyar religion. Yet Croatia and Slavonia had the privilege of excluding all Protestants, Magyars as well as others, from holding property or even from residing there; and when the General Diet of Hungary, the Magyar Diet, as Mr. Bowen delights to call it, passed a more tolerant law, it was nullified by the bigoted Croats! This single fact is sufficient to refute Mr. Bowen's repeated assertions that the Magyars domineered over and oppressed the Croats and Slavonians, and that the late war was commenced for the purpose of keeping the latter races in subjection. It is in fact sufficient to explode his whole position on the subject of Hungary, and, I repeat, that I do not wonder that he was unwilling to quote it.

I will copy one more of Mr. Bowen's quotations from Paget, [N. A. R., pp. 228–9.]

“One of the fundamental laws of the Saxons (Germans) is the equality of every individual of the Saxon nation. They have no nobles, no peasants. Not but that many of the Saxons have received letters of Nobility, and deck themselves out in all its plumes; yet as every true Saxon will tell you, that is only as Hungarian nobles, not as Saxons. Their municipal government was entirely in their own hands; every village chose its own officers, and managed its own affairs, without the interference of any higher power. [A few years ago, however, a great and arbitrary change was made in this institution, which though it almost escaped notice at the time, has since excited the most bitter complaint. The whole of this transaction was managed without the consent either of the Diet or the Saxon nation. Its effects have been to deprive the Saxon communities of the free exercise of their privileges, and to deliver them into the power of a corrupt bureaucracy, over which they have little or no control.”]—[Vol. ii., pp. 211–12, Am. ed.]

Mr. Bowen omitted the latter portion of the quotation, I suppose, because it showed that the condition of the Saxons, as described in the first portion, had been changed even before Mr. Paget's visit to them, which was about fifteen years ago, and changed, too, not by the Magyars, but by the arbitrary act of the Austrian Government. Mr. Paget, on the same page, relates that Magyar and Saxon deputies went together to Vienna, to remonstrate with the Emperor against these proceedings.

Among his thirty pages of citations, Mr. Bowen has one from McCulloch's Universal Gazetteer, or Geographical Dictionary, which through inadvertence, I presume, he cites as McCulloch's "Com. Gaz.," Mr. McCulloch being the author of a Commercial Dictionary. In examining the Eight Points of his rejoinder to Mrs. Putnam, I had occasion to expose the mode in which he had quoted from this same work of McCulloch's. The following specimens will be found equally remarkable.

"The internal government of the nation is a mixed monarchy and aristocracy. Laws can only be enacted by the joint consent of the King and the Diet; and although the executive power be said to lie with the King, yet the sovereign has only the nomination of Lords Lieutenant (*obergespanne*) of counties, and administrators; since every other public officer is either elected by the county itself, or named by its Lord Lieutenant—a nomination, however, which is often successfully disputed. * * * * * Under the kings of the reigning house, a great portion of Hungary and of the annexed districts was conquered from the Turks by great exertion on the part of the other imperial States; and many important alterations, in the relations of the King and the estates took place at different times. What are called the cardinal privileges of the nobility and clergy, who are looked upon as equal to the nobility, have been preserved to the present day, to an extent unparalleled in any country in Europe. * * * * * The nobles being mostly Magyars, it follows that the Magyar nation has been chiefly instrumental in maintaining the constitution during so many centuries."—[McCulloch's Com. Gaz., (New York Ed.), 1845, pp. 1142-1144.]

I have copied the whole extract, even to a comma, exactly as it stands in the North American Review, Jan., 1851, pp. 208-9. The reader will notice that apparently the whole passage is in McCulloch's own language, Mr. Bowen giving no indication that it is not. He will notice also that it is stated towards the close of the quotation, that the privileges of the nobility have been preserved to the *present day*, to an extent unparalleled in any country in Europe, and that the only date given in connection with

the extract is 1845. My copy of McCulloch is of the same edition as that which Mr. Bowen uses—the New York edition, published by the Harpers. On turning to it, I find that the last clause of Mr. Bowen's quotation, "The nobles being mostly Magyars," &c., consisting of three lines, is taken from the section on the Finances of Hungary, on p. 1144—the rest of the quotation being extracted from the section on the Constitution, pp. 1142-1143. I find also that not a word of the quotation, except the three lines from the section on the Finances, is McCulloch's own language, but on the contrary, is from an Austrian document which McCulloch puts in quotation marks, and which he introduces in this manner:

"The following account of the Hungarian constitution is given in the official report drawn up for the use of the Emperor's Cabinet, by Baron de Baldacci, and may be looked upon as a declaration of the rights of the nation *on the part of the crown*."

When it is known that the Hungarians, at the date of that document, were engaged in a contest with their king, on the subject of their rights, precisely similar to that which the English House of Commons maintained so long against the Stuarts, the significance of the phrase I have italicized, *on the part of the crown*, will be evident enough; and evident enough also will be the injustice of quoting against the Hungarians such a document, and passing it off as the statement of the impartial and intelligent McCulloch. Mr. Bowen might, with as much propriety, copy one of Hallam's quotations from the manifestoes of Charles I., and offer it to his readers as that historian's statement of what the constitution of England really was in the early part of the seventeenth century. But the injustice of the quotation will be made still more manifest by the following passage from McCulloch's own pen, which immediately follows the last words of Mr. Bowen's quotation: "in any country in Europe."

"Such were the claims asserted and the privileges allowed by the King of Hungary in 1831. That the political privileges of the nobles have been maintained, should, perhaps, be matter of rejoicing, *when the services they have recently conferred on their countrymen are taken into account*; and still more, when they have been the means of preserving what will no doubt become, in the end, a really free system of government. *At present* [1840], *except the right of election*, which is vested in the 267,300 nobles, *there is no political privilege which the lowest Hungarian does not enjoy in common with the inhabitants of the other constitutional States of Europe.*"

Now, why did Mr. Bowen suppress the above passage, and especially the date of 1831? He knew, for he had repeatedly admitted the fact in his articles, that immense changes were effected in the condition of Hungary, in the years that immediately succeeded 1831. Or if he had forgotten his own statements, he could not have failed to be reminded of the fact by McCulloch, whose article on Hungary he seems to have ransacked for scraps which, when detached from their proper connection, would apparently serve his purposes. I will quote some of the passages I refer to, which it is impossible Mr. Bowen could have overlooked, and to which he makes not the slightest allusion.

"Of late years, the higher classes have been laudably active in endeavoring to ameliorate the condition of the lower orders, by the foundation of schools, the distribution of useful works, attention to the state of prisons, &c.; and their private beneficence has been effectually aided by the grand legislative measure of 1836, which so much extended the civil rights of the peasants. By the act of the Diet of that year, called the '*Urbarium*,' the nobles gave up in principle two of the most obnoxious privileges of their order—freedom from taxation, and the right of being judges in their own causes in manorial courts. The exemption from taxation was waived, not by a voluntary acceptance of burdens, which would have occasioned a vast revolution in property, and endangered one of the most valuable advantages of the Hungarian constitution; but by the enactment that if a noble purchased a peasant's holding liable to taxation, the noble should continue to pay the impost. *In some respects, the lords were placed in a disadvantageous position by the new law, as the peasants may leave, sell, or transfer their holdings at will; whereas, the lord has no power over them, except that of execution for rent.* * * * * To this decree of the Diet, *which, as a voluntary act of self-renunciation by the nobles, has no parallel in the annals of any other nation,* other measures have since been added of scarcely less importance. A decree of the Diet of 1839 secures to the peasant the right of disposing by will of all kinds of property. In 1840, the Diet passed a bill declaring Catholics and Protestants to stand upon an equal footing in contracts of marriage, neither confession being suffered to impose restraints upon the other, and admitting Jews to equal rights with other commoners throughout the kingdom." Pp. 1138-39.

These were McCulloch's statements in 1840, of the condition of Hungary, and of the character of her nobility; as patriotic a race of men as ever existed, according to the testimony of all writers on the subject except Mr. Bowen. De Langsdorff, another of Mr. Bowen's authorities, speaking of the act of the Diet of 1836, says:

"This was the first breach made in the privi-

leges of the nobility; and it was by the nobility that it was made. There, where I felt only a sterile emotion, generous citizens, sacrificing their interests without hesitation, found the opportunity to repair a long injustice. Since that time, the Hungarian nobles have walked resolutely in that path; it is they who for twenty years have been laboring to file the chains of their subjects; it is they who, in a solemn day, have willed to break them forever.—*Revue des Deux Mondes*, August 1, 1848, p. 402.

The solemn day to which M. de Langsdorff alludes, was in March, 1848, when the last vestiges of "feudalism" were swept away by the Hungarian Diet, and equal rights granted to all the inhabitants of Hungary, without distinction of race or birth. Another of Mr. Bowen's authorities, and a highly respectable one, M. Degerando, said in 1845, in a passage quoted in the N. A. Review, April, 1850, p. 329:

"To the Hungarian nobility belongs the honor of having been the first to propose all these new laws. Under the eyes of a retrograde government, they are accomplishing a task, before which the aristocracies of every other country have shrunk back. They prepare the reign of equality, before the people for whose good they labor have yet thought of raising their voice. * * * * Not only does this aristocracy accord the rights granted to the inferior classes, but it also despoils itself of the privileges that it has possessed for ten centuries; it offers spontaneously to pay imposts to which it has never been subjected, and breaks of itself the last barrier which separates it from the people."

Mr. Bowen himself, in his Review for January and April, 1850, admitted, though as reluctantly and as obscurely as he could express it, that "for twenty years preceding the recent war," beneficial changes had been going on [p. 106]; that each successive Diet, during that period, passed new measures of reform [pp. 107, 516]; that, after 1843, only a single question remained to be settled [p. 516]; and that this question was settled in 1848 [p. 517] when "the work of social reform" was finished—reluctantly indeed, but still finished—by Kosuth's ministry [p. 516]. The Hungarian nobility relinquished the last of their exclusive privileges in March, 1848. In October, 1848, seven months afterwards, the war with Austria began. And now in the face of his authorities and in the face of his own admissions, let us listen to Mr. Bowen's deliberate summing up of his statements about Hungary in the North American Review for Jan., 1851. [pp. 238-9.]

"Since the fall of the aristocracies of Venice and Poland, the Magyars in Hungary, with few exceptions, have been the most arrogant, cruel and tyrannical nobility in Europe. The robber

barons of the middle ages did not more fully merit the vengeance which sometimes overtook them at the hands of their despairing vassals, than did these semi-barbarous nobles the ruin which has at length befallen them. They have kept their country three centuries behind the age, for the sole purpose of retaining their odious privileges as an order and a race. The policy even of Austrian despotism was liberal and enlightened, compared with theirs. They were the firmest supporters, the pliant instruments and vassals of that despotism, so long as it would aid them in riveting the chains upon their unhappy subjects. When that aid was withdrawn, they turned fiercely against the power to which they had so long submitted without a murmur, and at the same moment found themselves surrounded, as with a wall of fire, by their revolted and desperate vassals. Slowacks and Wallachians, Servians, Germans, and Croats, races separated from each other by the widest differences of languages, manners and religion, were now united by a common hatred of the Magyars, and fought against them with a long restrained thirst for vengeance, and with all the energy of despair."

What an extraordinary people these Magyars must be—according to Mr. Bowen. First, they labored for twenty years to effect measures of reform by which all their peculiar privileges were given up, and by which they placed themselves on a perfect political equality with the other races;—and then, seven months after they had thus voluntarily relinquished the last of their privileges, "they turned fiercely against" Austria because it would not "aid them in riveting the chains upon their unhappy subjects"—"their revolted and desperate vassals"! It is possible, however, that these inconsistencies may really exist, not in the conduct of the Magyars, but in the memory of Mr. Bowen, of the peculiar shortness of which, abundant evidence was exhibited by Mrs. Putnam in the *Christian Examiner*. The following is one of the instances which she cites. In the *North American Review* for January, 1851, p. 221, speaking of the proclamation by which Jellachich, Ban of Croatia, was deprived of his office, which proclamation Mr. Bowen maintained to be a forgery, he said—"Towards the close of it allusion is made to the fact that the emperor had summoned Jellachich to come before him and defend his conduct, which summons, *it is foolishly alleged*, he had refused to obey. * * * Now, it is *notorious* that he did appear before the emperor at Innspruck, in June, as summoned." Here, Mr. Bowen, to show the falsity and absurdity of a document which does not please him, says that it "*foolishly alleges*" that Jellachich had "*refused to obey*" the emperor's summons, when "*it is notorious*" that he did

obey. Now, Mr. Bowen himself, just twelve months before, had made the very same statement which he here condemns as having been "foolishly alleged," and had himself denied this "notorious" interview! In the *N. A. Review* for January, 1850, p. 124, he said :

"The emperor, who, in the middle of May, had secretly left his capital and taken refuge at Innspruck, temporized at first; but as the conduct of the Czechs at Prague grew more outrageous, he became more hostile to the Slavonian cause, and summoned the Ban to meet him in the Tyrol, and to give an account of his conduct. Jellachich *not only refused*, but attended the Slavonian Diet, which he had called at Agram, where he was formally elected Ban by that assembly, having hitherto held his office by imperial appointment. *The emperor then denounced him as a rebel, and ordered him to be deprived of all his offices and titles.*"

Mr. Bowen's articles on Hungary abound in inconsistencies of this kind, for it is only by such inconsistencies that the facts which he encounters in the course of his argument could be made to bend in accommodation to his theories. Mrs. Putnam's exposure of them will well repay perusal not only by its extraordinary learning, but as one of the best instances in our literature of candid, sagacious and triumphant criticism.

In closing this review of the articles of Mr. Bowen, I can honestly say that I have not half exhausted the record of his perversions, plagiarisms and falsifications. To expose them all would, in fact, require a considerable volume, for Mrs. Putnam's assertion that "there is hardly a sentence in his principal article in which an error is not either expressed or implied," is literally true. I do not believe that there can be found elsewhere in the English language in the same compass, so many blunders, so many falsehoods, so much literary dishonesty. Yet it was with a consciousness of these crimes against the truth, that Mr. Bowen put on an air of righteous indignation, and charged Mrs. Putnam with falsehood, and with having "deliberately forged historical statements, in order to damage his reputation and deprive him of office." No wonder such words were so ready to his lips, when the things they signify were so familiar to his mind.

MR. BOWEN'S DEFENCE OF HIS ARTICLES.

The greater part of the foregoing remarks on Mr. Bowen's articles appeared in the *Boston Atlas*, last winter. My last communication was handed to the editors of that paper on Jan. 25,

1851, but did not appear till February 3. On February 6, the overseers of Harvard University were to meet for the purpose, among other things, of confirming or rejecting Mr. Bowen's appointment to the Professorship of History which he had held for some months. On the morning of that day, a letter from Mr. Bowen to the editors of the *Atlas*, appeared in that paper as a reply to my criticisms. It may be supposed to contain all that Mr. Bowen had to say in defence of himself, and in justice to him, I shall republish it entire, with the exception of a few portions of a merely personal nature, and of a long appeal to the newspapers to let him alone for the future, so far as the war in Hungary is concerned.

I have indicated by figures some passages, remarks on which will be found below.

TO THE EDITORS OF THE *ATLAS* :

Gentlemen :—As you have devoted twelve or fourteen columns of your paper, within the last few weeks, to severe comments upon my conduct and writings, I will ask the favor of you to give me about one-tenth part as much space for a few remarks in reply.

Little more than a year ago, I published an article in which, while severely censuring the conduct and policy of Austria, I advocated to the best of my ability the cause of the Hungarian "subject races," of Slavonian, Wallachian, and German descent—about eight millions in number, who had recently broken their chains and risen up fiercely against half a million of Magyar nobles, who had held them in servitude for nearly eight centuries, and had recently crowned their highly oppressive treatment of them by making it penal for them to speak their own language. This article gave great offence to a few Magyar and Polish nobles resident in this country; and through some penny newspapers (1) they published such bold denials of the truth of history in regard to it, and such scurrilous attacks upon the character of its author, that I was obliged to write a second article, (in April, 1850,) in which the testimony adduced in support of the allegations contained in the former one, was so complete and satisfactory that no doubt remained upon the minds of intelligent persons, and no further attempt was made for seven months to convict me of holding anti-republican sentiments, or the N. A. Review of making historical blunders. (2) But within the last three months, these attempts have been renewed with so much acrimony, and carried on to so great an extent, that I have been again forced to break silence, though very reluctantly, and to produce still more testimony against the cause of the Magyar aristocrats, and in favor of their insurgent, and now triumphant subjects, their former serfs and slaves. This I did in two letters to the Boston Daily Advertiser, and in an article in the N. A. Review for January last. In the latter, I summoned into court a crowd of witnesses, English, French, German, and Hungarian, professing all forms of political doctrine,

whose united and harmonious testimony can leave no doubt upon a mind of ordinary capacity, however unwelcome the truth may be, or how obstinate soever the bias by which its reception at an earlier day was prevented. The article is little more than a string of citations from authorities which few will be hardy enough to dispute. By arranging and linking together these extracts, I merely told the story of the civil war in Hungary over again, only using the language of a crowd of reputable and unimpeached witnesses, instead of my own; and it may safely be left to the reader to decide which form of the statement is more injurious to the Magyars.

Some of these witnesses were Magyars, and their testimony was, consequently, of great weight. The explicit admissions of an opponent, every one knows, form the most valuable and unimpeachable kind of evidence: Schlesinger was the chief witness of this class. (3) When his testimony was first adduced, in my first letter to the Advertiser, I said, speaking of his book: "*Of course the work contains many extravagant assertions and perversions of fact, designed to procure sympathy for the Magyars in other lands* ; but as the book was designed for circulation in Germany and England, it also contains many admissions and frank acknowledgments which are not calculated to favor that cause in Republican America. Want of space obliges me to restrict my citations from it; but enough may be gleaned to confirm my general position that the war in Austria was a war of races, first waged among the Hungarians themselves, and not a revolt of the whole nation against Austria."

And, to "prevent all caviling," in a note to the article in the Review, I added: "To save space, we have been obliged to make the extracts as brief as possible; but the omissions are indicated, and the exact references to the volumes and pages will enable any reader to verify them with little difficulty." (4) Yet your correspondent, R. C., who has occupied eleven mortal columns of your paper with an attempt to answer my articles, has actually devoted a large portion of this large space,—nearly the whole of his last communication,—to very superfluous proof that these Magyar writers, (5) Schlesinger particularly, make many other assertions, besides those which I had cited—these others being very favorable to the Magyar cause. Of course they did; no attentive reader of my articles could doubt the fact; the few sentences just quoted indicate it very clearly. The fact only strengthens my argument. With all their predilection for the Magyar cause, which was their own cause; with all their rash assertions in favor of this cause, their candor and love of justice, as R. C. would say, compelled them to make admissions enough to justify nearly every one of my statements. R. C. need not have spent a month, as he says he has done, in painful study of my articles, and of the authorities to which I referred him, for the purpose of pointing out omissions, the places of which I had carefully indicated throughout; any reader of common intelligence, with the books at hand, might have performed R. C.'s month's work in fifteen min-

utes. The volume and the page were given; and asterisks, or some other mark, showed just where he was to look for the omitted passage, which passage itself proved that it was quite irrelevant to the point at issue, viz: that the Magyars themselves admitted nearly all that I had asserted respecting them. That they also said something else, in defending their own cause, was a quite irrelevant fact, with which I had nothing to do. That they did say such other things was a fact which, in general terms, I had already communicated to the reader; and I had also told him just where he might find them. (6)

I had also quoted from high official authority, accounts of eight brutal judicial murders, committed by the Magyar revolutionists, two of the victims being priests, and the third a woman seventy years of age. Without venturing to question one of these statements—nay, seeming to admit by implication that these accounts were correct, or that they were the best substantiated of the lot, R. C. objects that the list from which they are taken also contains accounts of many other cases, some of which, *he thinks*, are of doubtful authenticity. Very well; I did not quote one of these doubtful cases. I cited only those about which there appears to be no doubt; for R. C., with all his “learning and ability,” and a month’s study, does not venture to question one of them. Were these unfair citations on my part? (7)

I am further charged with citing from McCulloch’s Gazetteer, a statement which McCulloch makes, not on his own unsupported authority, but on that of Baron Baldacci; and R. C.’s commentary on this important fact would lead the careless reader to infer that McCulloch cited the passage only for the purpose of confuting it. But no such thing; McCulloch adopts it as his own, leaving it to be implied that it was the best account of the matter which he could find. As his whole work was a professed compilation from the highest and latest authorities that he could obtain, and as in this case he gives not only the name, but the exact words, of his authority, one would think that the passage was suited, above all others, for fair citation. (8)

The charge of plagiarism that is brought against me, by one who admits that five-sixths of my article were not borrowed from any writer, and that the other sixth, though founded on the statements of fact contained in a French Review, was so written that not one sentence of it was a literal translation from the original, but that the whole was a restatement of the facts in my own language,—this charge, I say, may be quietly put aside without explanation or defence. Full credit was given in the beginning of my article to the French writer for the aid that he had rendered. (9)

As your correspondent was seemingly unwilling to close so long a communication without adducing a particle of new testimony upon the subject, while I had brought forward a cloud of witnesses, he copies, from an old communication to the vilest penny newspaper in New York, a few sentences of vague denunciation of my article, which he says were written by a well known Polish Count, now resident in this coun-

try. It is quite likely that he did write them; I should be much surprised if one of the Polish nobility, who boasts that he held for some years an important office in the Russian Ministry, and stood high in favor with the Emperor Nicholas,—favor which he earned by publishing at Paris, in 1834, a harsh attack upon the principles and conduct of his own countrymen, who had then recently been engaged in their memorable struggle for freedom,—did not give his suffrage very heartily in favor of half a million of Magyar nobles, who endeavored to put down a rebellion of eight millions of their own hereditary bondsmen. Here in America, such testimony is sure to be appreciated at its true value. (10)

As an offset to this remarkable voucher of the genuine republicanism of the Magyars, I will now cite some testimony that came to me, quite unsolicited and unexpected, about two months ago. In November last, a gentleman whom I had never seen, though his name was familiar to me, came to my house, bringing a note from one of the most distinguished clergymen in Boston, introducing him as “a learned Hungarian, who, having read your article in the N. A. Review, expresses his admiration at the extent and accuracy of your acquaintance with the history of his country, and with the causes of the late revolution.” Of Sclavonic descent, born and educated in Hungary, which he quit- ted for the last time only in January, 1850, and having held high academical office, for which his acquisitions admirably fitted him, while his profession debarred him from taking up arms, he seemed qualified above all others in this country to form and express a fair and unbiassed opinion as to the merits of the respective parties to the contest. At the request of several gentlemen in Boston, he had procured and carefully read my article on the War of Races, and the one in reply to it in the last number of the Christian Examiner, in order that he might inform them which gave the more faithful and trustworthy account of the whole matter. He had expressed to them his opinion, without reserve; and they will doubtless be willing to say what that opinion was, if their testimony should be needed. The following is what he told me, as I reduced it to writing at the time.

He said, “I thought no one who had not been resident at least thirty years in Hungary, could have given as truthful a sketch as yours of the nature of the war in that country. It was ‘a war of races;’ it was a rebellion of the long down-trodden and oppressed Slavons and Wallachians against their insolent and cruel masters, the Magyars. Not a Slowack peasant joined the Magyar army, except by compulsion. Three of my own brothers were in this predicament: they were told, ‘enlist, or you must die;’ they did enlist, and were all killed. Many other Slowacks were in this way driven into the ranks, but all took the first opportunity to desert to the Austrians. The Austrian Emperor had always, to the full extent of his power, befriended the poor Slavon and Wallachian peasants, and protected them against the Magyar nobles; the Austrian government was, therefore, very popular among them. After the revolutions at Vienna and Pesth, the poor peasants

were in despair; they were abandoned to the dominion and wrath of the Magyars, who could now tyrannize over them without restraint. They sent one or two deputations to St. Petersburg, to implore help from the Russian Emperor. When the Austrian column, under Gen. Schlich, and especially when the Russians of Paskiewitsch's army, passed through my own town, I saw that they were received with the utmost enthusiasm. The common people turned out in great numbers, and many of them actually kissed the feet of the officers and soldiers, as their deliverers. I was, myself, in 1848, apprehended in Pesth for some remarks made in a coffee-house about the justice of putting all four languages on a par, and not forcing the Magyar tongue upon those who hated it; for this offence, I was imprisoned three months. The Magyars sent commissioners into the Slowack counties, who, with the aid of the troops, acted in the most insolent and barbarous manner. Kossuth was ennobled because he had received a university education; his parents were peasants. He became Magyarized, as some of the poor Slowacks did, who loved office and emolument better than their race; for no one not Magyarized could expect any preferment. They were *nobiles Magyarisati*, or Magyarized nobles. I tell these things to my own detriment and peril, knowing how much the sympathy of Americans has been excited on false pretences for the Magyars; but I am a minister of Christ, and must tell the truth. Here is a copy of the Christian Examiner for November, in which you will perceive I have underscored very many passages in the Magyar article, and put against them a mark signifying falsehood; while at the end of nearly all the extracts made in it from your article I have written *recte*."

So far the Slovac clergyman. I had not intended to print his testimony, which has been lying in my desk for nearly two months; for it seems to me to be of very little importance, in comparison with the positive and complete evidence from official documents, which I have cited in my articles in the Review. But as the coarsely expressed opinion of a Polish nobleman converted into a Russian Minister of State, is so confidently cited in favor of the Magyar aristocrats, I now offer the direct testimony of a Hungarian clergyman in favor of those poor Slavonian peasants whom Count Gurowski treats with lofty disdain. Your readers can decide which is the more trustworthy witness of the two.

And now, having put my authorities in the van, I beg permission to disappear behind them, and to hope that the pitiless storm of abuse, which has been beating upon me for the last fourteen months, may in future be directed against such haters of liberty and advocates of despotism as Lamartine, Pulszky, Lord Brougham, Rey, Schlesinger, and a dozen others, whose evidence I have cited. I fear the poor Slovac clergyman now brought forward will get his full share of it. (11)

* * * * *

FRANCIS BOWEN.

Cambridge, Feb. 4, 1851.

(1) The truthfulness of the impression which Mr. Bowen here seeks to convey, that his attack on the Hungarians gave offence only to "a few Magyar and Polish nobles resident in this country," and that the criticisms upon it were made "through some penny newspapers," may be inferred from the fact that it was criticized editorially by the Boston Atlas, the Boston Transcript, the New York Tribune, the New York Evening Post, the Washington Republic and other equally respectable journals. Whether or not their articles were written by Magyar or Polish nobles, I have no means of knowing, but presume that such was not the case.

(2) The statement that the testimony in Mr. Bowen's second article was "so complete and satisfactory that no doubt remained upon the minds of intelligent persons," may be true under a peculiar definition of "intelligent persons;" but as Mrs. Putnam expressly states in the Christian Examiner that it was this very second article which induced her to write her reply, and as that reply was written within the seven months to which Mr. Bowen refers, it is evident that there *was* an attempt during that period "to convict the North American Review of making historical blunders."

(3) "Some of these witnesses were Magyars — Schlesinger was the chief witness of this class." The writers whom Mr. Bowen was charged with garbling or perverting, besides Schlesinger, are De Langsdorff, Robertson, Coxe, Gibbon, McCulloch, Corvinus, Paget, Pulszky and Mrs. Putnam. Of these Pulszky is the only Hungarian, and even he is not a Magyar. Mrs. Putnam says he is of Slavonic descent. Nor is Schlesinger a Magyar. He is of German descent and though, born in Hungary, has for many years resided in Germany, chiefly at Berlin. His book was written in German and published in Germany. The author, in fact, was no way identified with the Magyars or their cause. Nor were all the other authors whom Mr. Bowen garbled favorable to the Hungarians. Corvinus and De Langsdorff are decidedly hostile to them, yet in quoting from even these writers, Mr. Bowen omitted all that was favorable to the Magyars, though the omission frequently left the quotation in such a state that it conveyed a meaning directly opposite to that which the writer intended.

(4) "The omissions are indicated, and the exact references to the volumes and pages will enable any reader to verify them with little difficulty." This "little difficulty" may be understood from the

fact that of the ten books whose titles are prefixed to Mr. Bowen's last article in the *North American*, seven are in German, and can be obtained in this country only by sending a special order to Europe for them. The three other works are in English. Of two of these, I could find no copies in Boston or Cambridge and those which I at length used were imported expressly for the purpose of "verifying" Mr. Bowen's quotations. As to the third work, the only copy I could hear of, belonged to the Library of Harvard University and was, when I enquired for it, in Mr. Bowen's possession. Yet, says Mr. Bowen, any reader can verify my quotations with little difficulty!

(5) The communication to which Mr. Bowen here refers, treated of his quotations from "Corvinus," the Austrian "Official List," Schlesinger, Paget the English traveller, Pulszky, McCulloch and De Langsdorff—and of no others. Of these, Pulszky is the only one whom Mr. Bowen could possibly suppose to be a Magyar.

(6) This is Mr. Bowen's whole reply to the charge of garbling his authorities. It will be seen that with his customary artfulness, he endeavors to make his readers believe that it was only Magyar writers whom he was charged with perverting—and that he attempts no defence of his fraudulent quotations from Robertson, Coxe, Gibbon, Paget, De Langsdorff, &c. The substance of his apology is that he omitted only "irrelevant" matter—which is not true; as the reader can satisfy himself by referring back to the specimens of his mode of quoting on pages 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, &c., of this pamphlet. Mr. Bowen might as reasonably attempt to prove that the Scriptures authorized suicide, by quoting the texts, "*Judas went and hanged himself—go thou and do likewise*"—and then justify his citation by pleading that he had omitted only "irrelevant" passages. If he had said of some poem he was criticising in his Review, "This poem excels the *Excursion* and rivals *Paradise Lost*—in length, if in no other quality:" he would hardly consider the poet justified in quoting the *North American* as authority for the opinion that his work "excels the *Excursion* and rivals *Paradise Lost*"—on the ground that he had omitted only something "quite irrelevant" and that "the explicit admissions of an opponent, every one knows, form the most valuable and unimpeachable kind of evidence." Yet this is precisely the mode in which Mr. Bowen has cited author-

ities against the Hungarians, and this is the sort of apology which he deliberately offers for doing so.

(7) I will ask the reader to look back to page 26, and then say if he ever saw a more flimsy or more disingenuous reply than this. Mr. Bowen, to prove that Kossuth and his associates were bloody and merciless tyrants, brings forward an Austrian official document containing a statement of several hundred cruel acts which it was alleged had been committed by the Hungarian government. To throw odium on the Hungarians Mr. Bowen quotes from this document the cases which appear to him most likely to serve his purpose. Commenting on his quotations, I said "the worthlessness of the thing is transparent," and quoted entire cases (some of which stood side by side with those quoted by Mr. Bowen) to show that the persons put to death were criminals—assassins, spies and deserters, who were executed by order of the regular military and civil tribunals. Yet Mr. Bowen says that I did not venture to question one of the cases he had quoted, and coolly asks, "were these unfair citations on my part?" He endeavors to make it appear that my objections were, that some of the cases "are of doubtful authenticity," and affirms that he cited only those about which there appears to be no doubt." My objection was that nine-tenths of the cases stated by the Austrian document were *on the face of them*, those of criminals who, if executed, were executed justly and legally, or of persons put to death by mobs for which the Hungarian government was no more responsible than the American government was for the murder of Joe Smith, the Mormon. Nothing could be meaner or more unjust than to cull out the most plausible passages from such a document, and hold them up as "high official authority," that Kossuth and his associates were tyrants and murderers.

(8) McCulloch cited the passage, as he expressly says, because it was "a declaration of the right of the nation *on the part of the crown*." And he immediately proceeds to state, in his own language, facts which *do* confute the inferences that Mr. Bowen sought to establish by quoting the language of Baron Baldacci. The statement of these facts Mr. Bowen suppressed, and substituted in their place a scrap taken from another section of McCulloch's article. If the passage from Baron Baldacci "was suited above all others for fair citation, because McCulloch gives the name as well as the words of his au-

thority," why did not Mr. Bowen give the *name* as well as the words? Why did he omit even the quotation marks, by which McCulloch had carefully distinguished the extract, and refer entirely to him as authority for the statement?

(9) This paragraph is meant for a reply to the charges [see *ante*, pp. 4, 5, 6] of plagiarism from the writers in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. Instead of saying as it now reads, "of the sixty pages of that article, at least fifty are taken directly from the *Revue*," &c. — I inadvertently wrote in the Boston Atlas, "of the sixty pages of that article, there are not fifty which are not taken directly from the *Revue*," &c. I did not perceive that the strict grammatical meaning of this, was the reverse of what I intended. But, as elsewhere I had explicitly enough stated that the "War of Races" was throughout a plagiarism from De Langsdorff and Desprez, it does not seem to me possible that Mr. Bowen could have really mistaken my meaning, as he pretends to have done. I did *not* admit that "five-sixths of his article were not borrowed from any writer," nor did I admit that the other sixth "was so written that not one sentence of it was a literal translation from the original." On the contrary, I quoted several passages in which there were dozens of sentences literally translated. The "full credit" given to MM. De Langsdorff and Desprez consisted in saying—"we depend for information chiefly on M. Degerando's book, and on a series of excellent articles contributed by E. de Langsdorff and H. Desprez to the *Revue des Deux Mondes*." [N. A. Review, p. 79.] I have shown, in preceding pages, that these "excellent articles," were depended on for something more than "information."

(10) This is an amusing specimen of Mr. Bowen's peculiar mode of reasoning. A Polish nobleman who was *opposed* to the attempt which the Polish nobility made to throw off the yoke of Russia, must of course, be *favorable* to a similar attempt on the part of the Magyars! And a Russian Minister, high in favor with the emperor Nicholas, must also, of course, be favorable to the Magyars, *whom the Emperor sent an army to subdue!* "Here in America such reasoning is sure to be appreciated at its true value." Mr. Bowen very well knows that Count Gurowski is a republican in sentiment, and that he is neither a Magyar, nor a partisan of the Magyars, though with all his Slavonic partialities he is too candid to deny, that, in their war with

Austria, they were fighting for freedom and republican institutions.

(11) In reply to the "testimony" of this "Slovak clergyman," whom Mr. Bowen, it will be observed, takes good care *not to name*, it is only necessary to enlarge a little Mr. Bowen's own statement, and add a few particulars which he saw fit, judiciously enough, to omit. Perhaps he forgot them. They are these. Some time previous to November, 1850, this "Slovak clergyman" arrived in this country from England, and represented himself as on a mission to obtain contributions for the assistance of the Unitarians of Hungary. He stated that his object had been favorably regarded by the Unitarians of England, and that he had received pecuniary assistance from them on account of it. He was well received in Boston and its neighborhood, and obtained, from Unitarian gentlemen a considerable sum of money for the use of the Unitarian churches in Hungary. He called on Mr. Bowen, as we have seen, and expressed himself delighted with his articles on Hungary. He called on persons who differed from Mr. Bowen in opinion, and was equally delighted with the soundness of *their* views. Mr. Bowen appears to have intended to use his "testimony" in his letters to the Boston Daily Advertiser, which were published in the last week of November, 1850. In one of those letters he alludes to this "Slovak clergyman" as "*my informant*," in a way which shows that the testimony had been inserted, and then hastily suppressed. Why it was suppressed, may be conjectured from the fact, that just before Mr. Bowen's communication appeared in the Advertiser, letters were received in Boston from well-known Unitarians in England, conveying information about the character and conduct of this "Slovak clergyman," the receipt of which was speedily followed by his disappearance from the eyes of those who had been accustomed to behold him. With him also disappeared the money which had been contributed for the benefit of the Unitarians of Hungary. The last certain intelligence that I have of him is, that not long after his detection by the Unitarians, he was confronted and exposed by one of his own countrymen, who found him, in a neighboring town, endeavoring to pass himself off as a Universalist, and discouraging unctuously upon the progress of Universalism in Hungary. I have no doubt that if Mr. Bowen had charged the Magyars with cannibalism, this man would have testified that he

had seen them dining on the bodies of Slovacs, Croats, Wallachians, &c. Neither have I any doubt that Mr. Bowen speaks the truth, when he says that he had not intended to print his testimony—for he knew perfectly well its utter worthlessness. It is to be regretted that he did not adhere to his intention, or at least not depart from it on the very eve of the meeting of a body which was to decide whether he should retain or be rejected from a respectable and lucrative professorship. Such testimony as that of this "Slovak clergyman," should not have been brought forward in so confident a manner, at such a moment. I need scarcely say that it is a tissue of falsehood from beginning to end.

Before taking final leave of Mr. Bowen's articles on Hungary, it may be worth while to remark here, as a significant characteristic of them, that whenever he has occasion to speak of a man with a title, a Prince, a Count, a Baron, &c., it is invariably with marked respect—especially if the person so distinguished be a partisan of despotism. The putting to death of such a man he appears to regard as a crime almost too horrible to be thought of, but for plebeians who suffer a similar fate he expresses little sympathy. He never alludes to the deaths of Count Lamberg and Count Latour without a visible shudder, or without applying the most severe epithets to the deed. But of the brave and honest Hungarian General, Damianich, he says:—[N. A. R., Jan., 1851, p. 223]—"It is some consolation to know that this ruffian was one of the insurgent generals hanged at Arad after the surrender of Georgey." The great leaders of European republicanism, even the most illustrious in character and ability, are never mentioned without a sneer. Lamartine he speaks of as "*our poor, phrase-making, gaseous friend Lamartine*"—Mazzini, whom it is charitable to suppose that Mr. Bowen is really as ignorant of, as he appears to be—is dismissed with brief contempt as "a veteran conspirator"—to conspire against the despots of Europe being, with Mr. Bowen, an unpardonable crime. Garibaldi, the Italian patriot hero, he calls "a leader of brigands." Kossuth, Mr. Bowen treats still more vilely. He never mentions the illustrious Hungarian without a feeble sneer, or a mean insinuation. He calls him "a Slovak lawyer," "a demagogue and radical of the lowest stamp," "a fanatic and ultraist," "a flaming patriot," and a "renegade." He even descends so low as to rake up a calumny which appeared

in the English newspapers during the Hungarian war, (and was immediately and conclusively refuted,) to the effect that Kossuth, in conjunction with Georgey, had murdered Count Zichy, and, as Mr. Bowen phrases it, had "robbed the house of their victim after his execution, and carried off from it some diamonds, emeralds and other articles of costly jewelry." In his anxiety to defame Kossuth, Mr. Bowen takes special pains to explain to his readers that "the accusation was, that the Magyar leaders devoted these valuables to *their own uses*, and did not put them into the treasury of their party."—[N. A. R., Jan., 1851, p. 227]—That is to say, "the accusation was," that Kossuth is not only a *murderer*, but a *thief*!

MR. WEBB'S ATTACK ON THE HUNGARIANS.

Mr. James Watson Webb, who is sometimes called Colonel, and sometimes, I believe, General Webb, the editor of the New York Courier and Enquirer, printed as a supplement to his paper of April 12, 1851, a very long and virulent attack upon the Hungarian cause, in which he said, "Our aim will be to show that Kossuth and his associates are entitled to none of our sympathy and but little of our respect * * * and that there is cause for every Republican heart to throb with joy instead of being shrouded in grief, that the war in Hungary terminated in the overthrow of Kossuth and his associates, in their heartless attempt to achieve their own independence of Austria, and at the same time of enslaving forever nearly ten millions of their countrymen."

The following, among other positions, were laid down as clearly established by Mr. Webb, in this article:

That Hungary consists of thirteen millions and a half of people, of whom four millions and a half are Magyars (600,000 of them *Nobles*,) and about nine millions Croats, Wallachians, and other Slavonic Races.

That for eight centuries and upwards, the four and a half millions of Magyars, have kept in the most servile bondage the nine millions of the Slavonic races—whence is derived our term *slave*, as applied to the Southern Negro.

That the slavery of this *ten millions*, was of the same absolute character as our Negro Slavery, only much more severe, because until abolished by METTERNICH, in 1845, the Magyar Noble had the power of life and death over the white *Slave*, who is in intellect the equal of his master.

That the *Magyars* having forced Austria to recognize their almost entire independence of the Empire, the *Slavonians* of Hungary, actuated by the general spirit of Liberty which pervaded Europe in 1848, and headed by the gallant JELLACHICH, BAN of Croatia, demanded from the Hungarian Diet, their FREEDOM, and equality of social and political rights; which the *Magyars* and the Magyar Government refused—KOSSUTH being the Minister of Finance, and the principal man in the Government.

That therefore, the Ban of Croatia, and all the *Slavonic* races, rose in revolt against their oppressors.

That this war was commenced by Hungary against Austria, by KOSSUTH's marching an army to Vienna, without Hungary's complaining of any grievance against Austria—except that the Emperor would not aid the *Magyars* to keep the *Slaves* in bondage—personal and political.

That never until the 28th of July, only twelve days before the final fall of KOSSUTH, GEORGEY, and the Magyar nobility, did they ever even pretend to fight for freedom or liberty, or offer equal rights to all races in Hungary.

That KOSSUTH and his Government warred in defence of *Slavery* and *Oppression*, and against personal freedom, political liberty, and equality of personal and political rights; and that all good men and friends of liberty throughout the world, should rejoice in his overthrow; because it broke the chains of nine millions of white *Slaves*, held in bondage, and denied even personal as well as political freedom, by four millions and a half of proud, haughty and ambitious *Magyars*—a Tartar tribe, who for eight hundred years, have held in slavery the descendants of the *Slavonic* races, which they subjugated in the eleventh century.

These propositions comprise the substance of Mr. Webb's charges against the Hungarians. The first of them is sufficient to show that he is grossly ignorant on the subject of the races of Hungary; for he speaks of the *Wallachians* as *Slavonians*—which is as absurd a blunder as it would be for a writer on America, to call the *Cherokees* an Anglo-Saxon race. I might, in fact, properly enough dismiss the whole statement on the ground of its palpably outrageous improbability—for what man of sense can be made to believe that four millions and a half of *Magyars* could, at the same time, successfully resist the armies of the Austrian Emperor, and keep in check ten millions of revolted *Slaves* “in intellect the equal of their masters”? But Mr. Webb, like Mr. Bowen, relies on “authorities” for proof of his proposition, and the greater part of the ten huge columns of his article are filled with quotations—all of which, with one or two exceptions, are stolen from Mr. Bowen's articles in the *North American Review*. I say stolen, because Mr. Webb takes them without

the slightest acknowledgment, copying word for word and letter for letter, nearly the whole of Mr. Bowen's translations and extracts, and passing them off as the result of his own reading and research.

In proof of this, I will analyze this article of Mr. Webb, column by column, and point out, in detail, his obligations to Mr. Bowen.

The first column is introductory, and borrowed substantially from Mr. Bowen, though Mr. Webb has taken the trouble to rewrite his plunder. He gives one of Mr. Bowen's tables of the population of Hungary—altering it, however, to suit himself so far as to convert 2,400,000 *Wallachians*, 260,000 Magyar *Szeklers* and 250,000 *Jews* into *Slavonians*!

The second column commences thus:

“The Magyar race numbers just about one-third of the population; yet in the hands of this one-third, for eight centuries have all power and authority rested, even to the life and death of the other races. They have ever been the masters—the other races the slaves; and never has slavery assumed a more servile attitude than in Hungary—never have masters exercised such despotic, absolute, and unlimited power, as the *Magyars* have for centuries exercised over their dependants.”

This is Mr. Webb's statement—“the *Magyars* are masters—the other races slaves”—and slaves of the lowest and most degraded kind. No more absolute slavery has ever existed. He had just before said, in the preceding paragraph, that “the *Croats*, *Wallachians*, and all the other *Slavonic* races, were as much slaves [to the *Magyars*] as are the negroes of Carolina slaves to their white masters.” “In support of this,” he proceeds to “quote largely from unquestioned sources.” Then follows his first quotation credited to “*M. Iley: Autriche, Hongrie, et Turquie en 1839-48, as cited by Corvinus*”—and “as cited by, Mr. Bowen,” Mr. Webb should have added; for he has copied it word for word from the *North American Review* for January, 1851, pp. 209-10. The anonymous “*Corvinus*” translated the passage from some obscure French writer, Mr. Bowen quoted it at second hand from him, and Mr. Webb gravely cites it at third hand from Mr. Bowen—without giving credit, however. Now let us see in what manner M. Rey, as cited by Corvinus, as cited by Bowen, supports Mr. Webb's theory that the *Slavonians* were all slaves, the *Magyars* all masters. The quotation begins thus:

“The ancient collection of laws, the *Tripartitum* declares that the nation or body politic, is composed exclusively of nobles; accordingly out of 550,000 nobles, the *Magyars* count 464,000,

which leaves only 86,000 with a proportionately feeble influence to the *Slaves, the Germans, and the Wallachians.*"

It appears from this, then, that these poor Wallachians, Slavonians, &c. who, according to Mr. Webb "are as much slaves, as are the negroes of Carolina slaves to their white masters" — count among their numbers no less than 86,000 nobles! The complaint of Mr. Webb's "authority" is, not that the other races were slaves to the Magyars, but that of the 550,000 nobles, too large a proportion belonged to the Magyar race, so that the other races had less political influence than their numbers entitled them to. The fact that there were 86,000 nobles of non-Magyar race, is sufficient to refute the assertion that the Magyars were masters and the other races in the condition of negro slaves. I may as well remark here, that no part of the population of Hungary has been in such a condition for the last six or eight centuries. There was a class of nobles and a class of peasants — but the nobles were of all races, and the peasants of all races — there being millions of Magyar peasants, and, as Mr. Rey states 86,000 nobles of Wallachian and Slavonian race. But the peasants were very far from being slaves, and before the war with Austria commenced, all legal or political difference between them and the nobles had been abolished.

Mr. Webb's Second Column contains seven other quotations: the *first* of which may be found on page 208, the *second* on page 207, the *third* on page 209, the *fourth* and *fifth* on page 210, and the *sixth* and *seventh* on page 211 of the N. A. Review for Jan., 1851.

Mr. Webb's Third Column contains three quotations. The *first*, he says, is from an authority universally respected — *Paget's Hungary and Transylvania*. He has copied it from the N. A. Review, p. 213. It is the same passage Mr. Bowen's unfair treatment of which, I have pointed out above, p. 29. Mr. Webb has copied it word for word, and has not even taken the trouble to change the references from the scarce English edition used by Mr. Bowen, to the common American edition published a year or two ago at Philadelphia. One of the passages omitted in this quotation of "an authority universally respected" relates to the fact that the Croatian Diét persisted in excluding Protestants from the country — a majority of their Magyar "masters" and "oppressors" being Protestants. Considering that they are "as much slaves as the negroes of Carolina," it is a little remarkable that these Croatians should not only have a

legislature of their own, but should actually take the liberty of excluding from the country the majority of their "masters," because of a difference of religion!

The *second* of the three quotations in Mr. Webb's Third Column, is taken from the N. A. Review, p. 217. The *third* quotation Mr. Webb introduces by saying "we quote from Count Mailath's *Geschichte* pp. 421-22." Count Mailath's *Geschichte* was published at Hamburg in 1850, and has not yet been translated. Probably the only portion which has appeared in English is this identical passage, which was translated by Mr. Bowen and printed in his Review. Mr. Webb's translation, singularly enough, corresponds to Mr. Bowen's, word for word, and letter for letter. He begins, like Mr. Bowen, in the middle of a paragraph and makes the very same omissions of inconvenient sentences. If he had not positively assured us that he "quotes from Count Mailath's *Geschichte* pp. 421, 422" (he is very precise in his references) the inference would be irresistible, that he had copied the extract from the N. A. Review, pp. 220, 221, 222.

In Mr. Webb's Fourth Column there are three quotations. The *first* and *third* of these are taken from the N. A. Review for Jan. 1851, pp. 222, 223, 224; the *second* is taken from the N. A. Review, Jan. 1850, p. 116. Mr. Webb does not give any authority for it, which is not to be wondered at, for he had too much prudence to refer to Mr. Bowen as an "authority," and as Mr. Bowen had translated the extract without acknowledgment from the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, it was of course somewhat difficult for Mr. Webb to give due credit for it! In introducing the quotations in this column, Mr. Webb unceremoniously appropriates several of Mr. Bowen's notes and observations.

Mr. Webb's Fifth Column contains only two quotations. One of these is avowedly taken from the N. A. Review for Jan. 1850, p. 125 — where it appears as original with Mr. Bowen; the other purports to be from an Austrian official pamphlet, of which I know nothing. It is an absurd and scandalous attempt to implicate Kossuth in the murder of Count Latour, who was put to death by the mob of Vienna in the sudden insurrection of October 6th, 1848, Kossuth at the time being in Hungary several hundred miles distant! As I have never seen the original, I cannot decide how much Mr. Webb has falsified this document, but one instance of perversion is so glaring as to be detected at first glance. An extract is given from a letter to Kossuth by

Csany, a well-known Hungarian, who writes on the 7th of October, that he has sent three couriers from Vienna to Pesth "with very agreeable news." This "very agreeable news" was, of course, the triumphant Democratic insurrection of the day before, and the flight of the Emperor to Innsbruck. Mr. Webb, however, attempts to deceive his readers by informing them, in a parenthesis, that this very agreeable news was the murder of Latour! This he repeats at every opportunity, whenever the news from Vienna is mentioned.

Mr. Webb's Sixth Column contains only *one* quotation—a long one from Brownson's Quarterly Review! The value of this, as an authority on the affairs of Hungary, it is not necessary to discuss.

Mr. Webb's Seventh Column contains *one* extract which is from a letter of Archbishop Ráiaichich, describing the cruelties practised in the South-eastern part of Hungary in the beginning of the war. It is copied from the N. A. Review for Jan. 1851, p. 224. It is dated Carlowitz, August 1, 1848. Mr. Webb introduces it by saying that "Kossuth despatched General Bem into Transylvania to strike terror into that region—*what Bem did there*, and how he conducted the war amid that simple and almost unarmed people, the *following document will show*. Comment is unnecessary."

"Comment is unnecessary," indeed, except to remark that the Archbishop's letter related not to Transylvania but to the Bannat, and that on the 1st of August, 1848, Bem had not yet made his appearance in the Hungarian war. On the 14th of October of that year, he, for the first time, appeared at Vienna, then in revolt against the Emperor. On his flight from that city, a fortnight later, he became acquainted with Kossuth, whom he met on the steamboat which was conveying them down the Danube. It was not till the 26th of November that Bem set out from Pesth to conquer Transylvania, and his military operations in that country did not fairly commence till the 20th of December. It is manifest, therefore, Mr. Webb to the contrary notwithstanding, that a document dated August 1, 1848, could not throw much light on Bem's proceedings four or five months afterwards. This is one of fifty instances, in which Mr. Webb betrays a ludicrous ignorance of the matter he so glibly writes about.

Mr. Webb's Eighth Column contains *three* extracts. The *first* is from a Hungarian Manifesto and is copied from the North American, Jan. 1850, p. 81. The *second* and *third* (origi-

nally from the *Revue des Deux Mondes*) are copied from N. A. Review, Jan. 1851, p. 235.

In Mr. Webb's Ninth Column there are *three* quotations, all of which are borrowed from the N. A. Review, pp. 212, 214, 234.

Finally in the Tenth and *last* Column there are *eight* quotations, all of which may be seen verbatim in the N. A. Review for Jan. 1851, pp. 205, 206, 219, 230, 234.

It appears, therefore, that of Mr. Webb's *thirty-two* quotations from "authorities," *thirty* are copied from the North American Review, without acknowledgment, and paraded before the readers of the New York Courier and Enquirer as the result of the laborious researches of the learned editor of that journal! Mr. Webb, in fact, has plundered Mr. Bowen as unscrupulously as Mr. Bowen plundered the writers in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. He does not appear to have seen one of the books from which he pretends to quote, and I am quite confident that his studies in Hungarian history have been confined almost entirely to the veracious pages of the North American Review.

In addition to his pilfered quotations from the North American Review, Mr. Webb endeavors to strengthen his position on the subject of Hungary by relating his personal experience in that country. In 1850, I think it was, he was appointed to represent this country at the court of Vienna, but the Senate of the United States by an almost unanimous vote refused to confirm so unfit a nomination, and Mr. Webb was speedily recalled from Austria. During his stay in Vienna, he says he made this whole subject his study, and afterwards pursued his investigations in Hungary itself. He thus details his experience:

When we had exhausted our research in Vienna, (!) and by conversations with the Magyar nobles learned precisely the feelings and objects and purposes of the late war in Hungary, we obtained permission from the Austrian Government, (at that period such a course was necessary,) and visited Hungary itself, to judge for ourselves of all we had heard. We penetrated as far as Buda and Pesth, (!) where we had every facility of pursuing our investigations unmolested; and we stopped at *Komorn*, and lingered at *Presburgh*, actuated alike by the recollections of the past and the sad desolation of the present. In our own happy country, thank God, we know nothing of the desolation of war; but above all and over all—of a *war of races*, as was most emphatically the war in Hungary; and to describe what we saw in this regard, would be only to make man hate his fellow man. One incident told us the whole story as regards the hatred of the now freed *Slave* to his late master.

In crossing the suspension bridge, which connects *Buda*, the ancient *Offen*, with *Pesth*—which by the way is the finest structure of the kind we met with—our coachman, once a *Slave*, now a free *Slave*, pointed exultingly to a man paying toll. We inquired of our courier what it meant; and he explained that the person pointed to, was a small *Magyar noble*, whose right it was, formerly, to pass, toll free, but who now was considered no better than the late *slave*, and was required to pay toll like him. The exultation of the *Slave* at this spectacle, his spirited crack of the whip, and almost hurra for freedom, told as plainly as words could have done, that the Magyar rule was at an end, and that tyranny and oppression fell with Kossuth and his Magyar nobility.

Great deference is due to the statements and opinions of the inquisitive and adventurous traveller who has explored foreign lands and speaks of what he has seen. And there is something peculiarly romantic and imposing in Mr. Webb's solemn assertion that he "stopped at Komorn and lingered at Presburg," and that he even "penetrated as far as Buda and Pesth." But with all my admiration for the intrepidity of his explorations, I cannot refrain from stating that steamboats ply regularly between Vienna and Buda-Pesth, and that the distance between them is just 135 miles, or ten miles less than the distance from New York to Albany! Komorn and Presburg are both upon the river, and the boat which conveyed the enterprising explorer, probably stopped at those places to land or receive passengers. Mr. Webb saw about as much of Hungary as a foreigner, ignorant of English, would see of the United States, who should land at New York, embark on a Hudson river steamboat, and "stopping" at West Point and "lingering" at Poughkeepsie, "penetrate as far as" —Albany!

The gross and almost incredible ignorance of Hungary which Mr. Webb displays throughout his article, is strikingly manifested in this account of his travels. He calls Buda "the ancient Offen." In reality Buda has been the name of the city from time immemorial. Offen is merely its *German* name. But the most palpable exposure of ignorance, if not of falsehood, is in the anecdote of the coachman, "once a *Slave* now a free *Slave*." The law which decreed that all passengers, whether nobles or not, should pay toll on this suspension bridge, was passed in 1836. It was passed by a Diet composed exclusively of nobles who thus voluntarily relinquished their privilege of passing a bridge toll-free. The privilege, too, had no connection with race. Slavonic nobles as well as Magyar nobles passed free, while Magyar peasants

paid toll as well as Slavonic peasants. And yet, in 1850, *fourteen years* after the passage of this law, Mr. Webb pretends that his coachman, "the late *slave*," was still so unused to the spectacle of a Magyar noble paying toll that his exultation was strong enough to tell "as plainly as words could have done, that the Magyar rule was at an end, and that tyranny and oppression fell with Kossuth and his Magyar nobility." I have not the least doubt that the story is a mere fabrication. The coachmen at Buda-Pesth, whether *Slaves* or not, have for centuries been as free as coachmen in New York. Every well-dressed man, of whatever race, was allowed to pass without paying toll on the old bridge, and on the new bridge, the coachman must have seen, every time he crossed it, dozens of men paying toll, who, fourteen years before would have been exempt. Mr. Webb's attempt to demonstrate by this invention that Kossuth and his party (by whose exertions the special privileges of the nobles were abolished) were tyrants and oppressors, is perfectly in keeping with the stupid ignorance and malignant falsehood which characterize his whole article.

Contemptible as this article is, it has, I am ashamed to say, acquired a certain degree of importance, and a good deal of notoriety, from having been read, in whole or in part, to the Senate of the United States as an argument against the Resolution of Welcome to Kossuth. But for this circumstance it would have been unnecessary to notice it as a part of the Hungarian Controversy. Neither in itself, nor from the character of its author, is it entitled to the least consideration.

THE POLITICAL STATE OF HUNGARY.

In the foregoing pages I have confined myself chiefly to an exposure of the *mode* in which Messrs. Bowen and Webb have sought to establish the truth of their charges against the Hungarians, without attempting directly to disprove the charges themselves. I think the reader will admit, that whether those charges be true or false, I have shown conclusively, that the methods resorted to in order to sustain them, are outrageously unjust and dishonest. I will now consider the charges themselves. The groundwork or basis of them all, is the political and social state of Hungary in the latter part of 1848, when the war with Austria began. It

is alleged by Messrs. Bowen and Webb that, at that period, the Magyar nobility were absolute masters of the country, all the political power of which was in their hands, and that they domineered over and oppressed the Croats, Slavonians, Wallachians, Germans and other races. These other races, according to Mr. Bowen, were the "subjects" and "vassals" of the Magyar nobility. "The present position of the Magyars in Hungary," he says, "is very much what that of the Normans in England was for the first century or two after the Conquest."—[N. A. Review, Jan., 1850, p. 91.]—Again, p. 122, he says of the Magyars, "*their cause was bad; they sought to defend their ancient feudal institutions, and their unjust and excessive privileges as an order and a race, against the incursion of the liberal ideas and the reformatory spirit of the nineteenth century.*" Mr. Webb, as we have seen above, (pp. 38-9) asserts that the other races in Hungary were absolute slaves to the Magyars—that their condition was even more degraded than that of the negro slaves of South Carolina. And both of these writers maintain that the Hungarian war was nothing more nor less than an attempt on the part of the Magyars, with Kossuth at their head, to keep their subject races down, while Austria was striving to raise them up.

Let us now see how far these statements are sustained by competent witnesses.

The best English book of travels in Hungary is "Hungary and Transylvania, by John Paget." Mr. Paget visited Hungary in 1835, thirteen years before the war with Austria. Mr. Bowen says his work is "excellent and impartial." Mr. Webb says he is "an authority universally respected." Here are some extracts from his chapter on "Country Life and Peasantry," chap. 11, volume 1.

"It was not till 1405 that the Hungarian peasant seems to have had a recognized civil existence. In that year it was first declared that the peasant should have the power to leave the place where he was born, in case he could obtain his lord's consent; which consent, however, it was provided, should not be arbitrarily refused. It must not be imagined that, because this was the first legal notice of the peasant's existence, he had formerly been treated as a mere slave. *Slavery had been, in fact, abolished on the introduction of Christianity.*" [A. D. 1000] * * * * "The spirit in which the new *Urbarium* [a law enacted by the nobles in 1835] is conceived, may be imagined from the avowed principle, *that where it was safe and proper, the rights of the peasant should be increased, and his burdens diminished; but in no instance should his privileges, however attained, be curtailed.*" * * *

Since the passing of this law, it can scarcely be said any longer that the peasant alone pays taxes; for it is especially provided, that should a noble purchase a peasant's fief he is not only liable to all the labor and payment of the landlord, but also to all the taxes of government, county rates, &c. * * * * I have entered thus at length into the laws affecting the Hungarian peasantry, especially those which regulate their intercourse with their lords; because I have been anxious to show that they are not, as strangers commonly suppose, serfs, nor their lords tyrants, with unlimited power over their lives and fortunes."

These are Mr. Paget's statements as to the condition of the Hungarian peasants in 1835. Here is what he says of the party to which Kossuth belonged—the party opposed to Austria:

"The favorite objects of their desires were, after strengthening the nationality of Hungary, freedom of commerce and an improved commercial code; the navigation of the Danube, and the improvement of internal communication; *increased freedom and education of the peasantry; the repeal of the laws preventing the free purchase and sale of landed property, perfect equality of all religions, and the freedom of the press. For the greater part of these objects they are still struggling.*" —[Vol. i., p. 102.]

Another high authority, a most accurate and intelligent writer, McCulloch, says in a passage which I have quoted before, (p. 30) and which was written in 1840—"At present, except the right of election, which is vested in the 267,300 nobles, *there is no political privilege which the lowest Hungarian does not enjoy, in common with the inhabitants of the other constitutional states of Europe.*"

Yet, says Mr. Bowen, the great mass of the Hungarian people in 1848, were serfs and vassals to the nobles, while according to Mr. Webb, they were more absolute slaves than the negroes of South Carolina!

In the Monthly Chronicle for August, 1841, a magazine which was edited, I believe, by Hon. Nathan Hale of the Boston Daily Advertiser, there is published a letter from an American gentleman travelling in Hungary, to his friend in Boston, which letter I have reason to suppose, was written by Mr. George Sumner, brother to Hon. Charles Sumner, of the United States Senate. He says, under date of May 1, 1841:

"I must tell you something of Hungary; of which you know nothing, (that I will venture to say at this great distance) and which is after Russia, the most interesting, and the most misrepresented country which I have visited. One can form no idea abroad of the movement which is going on among this people; it is really mighty. Their own journals are all in Hunga-

by a just combination of reasoning and feeling. Whilst some orators would enforce conviction by the strict logical consequence of their argument, and others seek to transport their listeners by an overpowering appeal to their feelings, Kossuth's eloquence consists in an alternation of effect, a magnificent blending of the two systems. In this harmony lies the power of his oratory, and the certainty of his success.

Whatever blame may be imputed to this remarkable man, no one has hitherto dared to attribute his actions to paltry or egotistical motives. He has invariably proved a true friend, and no mean spirit of revenge ever found access to his breast, or sprung up to check the free growth of his great virtues. Many of his early friends have at a later period separated from him, either from a feeling of mere envy, from political conviction, a fear of following out the consequences of his policy, motives of safety, or the like. But his honest, upright character was such, that his most dishonest enemies have never dared to assail it, except by secret and side attacks.

Let any man travel at the present day from

one end of Hungary to the other, and he will convince himself, perhaps to his surprise, that there is but one voice, one feeling respecting Kossuth, in the towns, on the landed estates of the nobility, and among the country people,—all revering him as the greatest, the most true-hearted patriot. An ignominious death has raised noteless persons to the rank of martyrs, and immortalized their names,—Kossuth will be worshipped as the martyr of his nation, without cross or gallows. He may pass his life in exile—be it even in outward comfort—whilst his countrymen at home are beggared, starved, imprisoned, shot and hanged; yet no Magyar will, in cool moments of reflection, charge Kossuth as the originator of the unspeakable misery that has befallen his country; so deeply is he assured of the real causes of the blow under which Hungary has succumbed, so convinced is he of the greatness of Kossuth's character, and of the grief he suffers in exile for his beloved country. "God in his mercy be with him!"—these are the words on the lips of every peasant in Hungary, since the disastrous termination of the struggle.

THE END.

ERRATA. On page 10, second column, ninth line from bottom, for "*was*" read "*has*".

On page 12, second column, twenty-ninth line from top, for "*Archbishop*" read "*Archdeacon*".